SEMINARY OF THE EAST LIBRARY
3 0513 40019 0910

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/historyofnewtest0003drah

THE TIME OF THE APOSTLES.

VOL. III.

C. B. S. E.

A HISTORY

OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT TIMES.

BY

DR. A. HAUSRATH,

ORDINARY PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF HEIDELBERG.

THE TIME OF THE APOSTLES.

VOL. III.

TRANSLATED, WITH THE AUTHOR'S SANCTION, FROM THE SECOND GERMAN EDITION, BY

L. HUXLEY, B.A.

WITH A PREFACE BY MRS. HUMPHRY WARD.

WILLIAMS AND NORGATE,

14, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON;
20, SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH;
AND 7, BROAD STREET, OXFORD.

1895.

H376
V. 3

LONDON:
PRINTED BY C. GREEN AND SON,
178, STRAND.

Denver Seminary Wal... Memorial
Co First Baptist Church of Glenarden
3600 Brightseat Road
Landover, MD 20785-2416

CONTENTS.

First Division.

The Early Career of Paul.

	PAGE
1. Cilician Home	3
2. Jewish Education	16
3. Paul as Lawyer and Pharisee	30
4. His Personality	42

Second Division.

The Conversion of Paul.

1. The Miracle of Damascus	55
2. The Glad Tidings as Jewish Theology	70
3. The Speculative Premisses of Pauline Theology	82
4. New Conception of the Law	88
5. The Messiah as the Second Adam	95
6. The New Manhood	103
7. The New World	114
8. Religious Genius	121

Third Division.

Paul's Sphere of Work in the East.

PAGE

1. Paul as Missionary 129
2. The Period in Antioch 140
3. Foundation of Churches in Galatia 146
4. The Struggle over Circumcision 163
5. The Struggle in Galatia 181

Fourth Division.

Activity among the Greeks.

1. Macedonia 203
2. Achaia 228
3. Proconsular Asia 252

First Division.

THE EARLY CAREER OF PAUL.

THE EARLY CAREER OF PAUL.

1. Cilician Home.[1]

In the usual course of events, great movements shape themselves, as it were, at the outset, before a leader takes them in hand. The great ideas are uttered and repeated by the multitude, are perhaps realized in small societies, until thought somewhere ripens into resolution, and an individual plucks up courage to make his lifelong profession of what the multitude practise as occasion offers. The man who did this for the Christian Church was Paul. So far, he begins a new epoch in the history of Christianity.

His importance lies, firstly, in the task to which he devoted his life. He took up the preaching of the Kingdom, which was heard no more in Galilee, and renewed it through all the length and breadth of the Dispersion. It lies, secondly, in his radical temper. He did not hesitate to push to its logical conclusions the doctrine that participation in the Kingdom was simply dependent on the relation to Jesus, and therefore rejected the Jewish law as superfluous and harmful.

Lastly, however, and chiefly, Paul's importance is that on the theoretical side he bridged over the rifts in the consciousness of the time, completing the reconciliation supplied in the teaching of Jesus. He boldly traced the foundations of a new conception of the world which replaced the disjointed dualism of a sensible and a spiritual world by the thought of both as

[1] Cf. my more detailed monograph, "The Apostle Paul," 2nd ed., Heidelberg, Bassermann, 1872.

united in one another by Christ. This thought became the starting-point of the mediæval view.

In attempting to investigate the origins of so creative a temperament, the want of all direct testimony necessitates a mere enumeration of the influences in his birthplace which necessarily or probably affected his growing genius, of the events which overshadowed his career, the impressions which it can be proved or surmised had power to mould or check or aid him. But it is impossible to get beyond the unsafe ground of conjecture where so few direct documents are extant, and the oldest biography is almost a century later than its subject.

According to this source, Paul came from Tarsus in Cilicia, a place where, it need hardly be said, there existed many influences to further Paul's peculiar development.

Cilicia, the south-eastern province of Asia Minor, belonged to that part of the empire which had suffered most in the later period of Roman rule. It had been the chosen field of battle in the Parthian, Armenian and civil wars,[1] while some of the most famous scenes in the life of Antony had passed in Tarsus, the capital of the province.[2]

Yet the city emerged from this turmoil with undimmed prosperity, so favourably was it situated; below the pass, the Cilician Gates, which led down from the heart of Asia Minor to the Mediterranean; and above the harbour of Rhegma, at the mouth of the Cydnus, which is navigable as far as Tarsus.[3] Nature had thus made Tarsus the emporium for the products of the Taurus and the interior of Asia Minor, which, perhaps, were in part manufactured here. Paul's own handicraft is mentioned as being the chief branch of industry in Tarsus, the manufacture, that is to say, of tent-cloth, cilicium, from the hair of goats, innumerable herds of which fed on the lower slopes of the Taurus.[4] Endless supplies of timber from the

[1] Dio Cass. xlvii. 27; 30, 31. [2] Cf. Vol. i. p. 225 (Eng. trans.).
[3] Strabo, xiv. 4 (p. 672); Plut. Anton. 26.
[4] Arist. De Histor. Animal. viii. 28; Martial, vii. 30.

mountains were floated down the river Cydnus to the coast,[1] where, in turn, the ships' cargoes were disembarked and carried up to the interior.[2]

In spite of the great traffic of the city, the remoteness of the whole province betrays itself in the proportionate vigour of the ancestral cults. Paganism was still unshaken here. Here the oracles yet spoke, and the Pythian god is conspicuous on the coins of Tarsus. Up to the time of Plutarch, "Apollo's holy sword" was still shown bright and untarnished by rust.[3] The luxurious Sardanapalus was honoured as founder by Tarsus and Anchiale, which lay west of the mouth of the Cydnus. In the twin city hard by we find a statue of him snapping his fingers; below is an inscription, repeated almost word for word in the great Tarsian's First Epistle to the Corinthians: "Eat, drink and make merry; with this there is naught else to compare."[4]

Now this supposed king Sardanapalus, here as elsewhere,[5] is a combination of the Greek Heracles with the old Asiatic Sun-god Sandan; the ritual ordinances attested by historians and coins of Tarsus characterize his worship as that of the Fire and Sun-god of Asia Minor named above.[6]

It accords well with the enduring strength of this religious life that the provincials flung themselves into philosophy, poetry and rhetoric, with the ardour of first love. At a somewhat earlier period than the one under discussion, Tarsus, according to Strabo's testimony, excelled even Athens and Alexandria in its love for philosophy and every other form of culture.[7] Its philosophers displayed a ready talent in their gift of improvisation

[1] Diod. Bibl. xiv. 39, and xiv. 19. [2] Strabo, xiv. 4.

[3] De Def. Oracc. ch. xli.

[4] Strabo, xiv. 4 (p. 672), *ἔσθιε, πῖνε, παῖζε ὡς τἄλλα τούτου οὐκ ἄξια.* Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 32.

[5] Cf. Hitzig, Urgeschichte der Philister, p. 228.

[6] Dio Chrys. l. c. p. 408. [7] Strabo, xiv. 4 (pp. 673—675).

and flowing eloquence. Every school, too, was well represented here. From Tarsus came the Stoics Antipater, Archedemus, Heraclides, Zeno and the two Athenodori, the Academic Nestor, the Epicureans Diogenes, Lysias and Plutiades, the poets Dionysides, Bion, Demetrius and Boethes, not to mention a host of grammarians and natural philosophers.[1]

The chief interest of the cultured Tarsian lay in the doings of the various schools. Further, the tribe of Sophists here was such as it was in Alexandria. The city was filled with the petty affairs and quarrels of the grammarians, which were continued even into after ages. Strabo thinks it fit and proper to record how one great teacher robbed the municipality of oil; how others avenged themselves on their adversaries with epigrams, or, if wit were lacking, by defiling their houses at night; how academic noise often ended in bloody earnest. The summit of a Tarsian teacher's ambition was a professor's chair at Rome, especially as Tarsus contained a preponderance of natives and had few foreign students.

Abroad, the schools of Tarsus early fell into ill repute; so, at least, we learn from Philostratus, who makes his hero Apollonius study at Tarsus during Paul's boyhood. "When Apollonius of Tyana," he says, "attained his fourteenth year, his father brought him to Tarsus, and committed him to the charge of the rhetorician Euthydemus. He indeed attended his teacher diligently, but thought the morals of the city objectionable and unsuited to philosophical studies. Given up to luxury beyond any other nation, full of buffoonery and petulance, they set greater store by finery than the Athenians by wisdom. The river Cydnus flows through the city; on its banks they sit like water-fowl, for which reason Apollonius writes to them in one of his letters, 'Cease to intoxicate yourselves on water.' Accordingly, he begged his father's permission to retire to the neighbouring Ægæ, where there prevailed a studious quiet and

[1] See Strabo, l. c., and the article "Tarsus" in Pauly.

greater earnestness. Here, too, there stood a temple of Æsculapius, and the god himself spoke to mortals."[1]

It is impossible to read such a description without thinking of the contempt for the Sophists which Paul lets us feel in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, when he thanks God that he did not find in the Church either a Sophist or a grammarian or a disputer of this world.[2] He had seen enough of this war of empty personalities, the rivalry of conceit, the persecution and chatter and espionage of this learned world; and all his life long he was full of that contempt for the wisdom of this world which is one of the fundamental characteristics of his thought.

We need not hesitate to seek the chief source of Paul's strictures in his own experience of Tarsus. Unquestionably, he was early filled with that horror of idols which characterizes his Epistles as strongly as any book of the New Testament, except perhaps the Apocalypse. We shall not be wrong in deriving these sentiments from the Jewish quarter of Tarsus, for the lasting strength of paganism cannot fail to have provoked equally strong antipathies among the Jews.

As we saw, this religious life centred essentially in the worship of the Sun-god Sandan, which still bore the character of a wild nature-worship. His chief feast, the Saccæa, was celebrated in cells; and the more this custom appeared a parody of the Feast of Tabernacles, the greater was the exasperation of the Jews.[3] Sardanapalus and Semiramis, in the relation of Heracles and Omphale, appeared in person at this feast to practise every description of wantonness. The wild orgies of this nature-worship ended with burning the king of the Feast, who, in Tarsus, was always replaced by an effigy on the funeral-pyre, while in other places the man who played the part actually suffered death.[4]

Here, then, the Jews found themselves confronted by forms

[1] Phil. Apoll. i. 7.
[2] 1 Cor. i. 20.
[3] Cf. Ezek. xxiii. 40.
[4] Movers, Phœn. p. 496.

of worship which their prophets had once fought against with fire and sword; the pulse of their religious life must have quickened at the thought. Evidence indeed exists to show that the Jews of Tarsus excelled others in religious zeal and national spirit. There is no question of Hellenizing here, as at Alexandria. For all that the Phœnicio-Syrian element predominated in Cilicia, the Aramaic dialect was not stamped out in the houses of the Jewish quarter, so that Paul can still call himself a Jew.[1]

The Jews of Tarsus shared the patriotic movements of the Maccabees to a certain extent, for Tarsus rose against Antiochus Epiphanes,[2] and the governor of Cilicia was that Apollonius whose emissary Heliodorus was cast out of the sanctuary by heavenly horsemen when attempting to despoil the temple.[3] So this latest display of power by the All-holy, of which the later books of the Jews are full, may often have been mentioned in Tarsus. Paul, at least, alludes to it in passing, when he says: "If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy."[4]

Another proof of the strongly religious character of the Tarsian Jews is that the Cilicians ranked among the regular participators in the feasts at Jerusalem. Here, too, they possessed their own synagogues—synagogues, indeed, which manifested their Cilician zeal with such sanguinary effect in the persecution of Stephen. Paul's own emigration to Jerusalem, and his sister's marriage there, show once more that Tarsus remained in touch with the priestly city. The Jews of Tarsus seem also to have taken part in the great Jewish war.[5]

The Apostle, too, seems to have had a dash of his countrymen's patriotic blood in his veins. His patriotism, indeed, is absorbed in the higher view that Christ is neither Jew nor Greek; nevertheless, he feels it to be the curse of God that the

[1] 2 Cor. xi. 22; Phil. iii. 5.
[2] 2 Macc. iv. 30.
[3] Jos. Macc. ch. iv.
[4] 1 Cor. iii. 17.
[5] Philostr. Ap. vi. 34.

holy city and her children are in servitude to Rome;[1] he can still find praise for Jewish zeal, even though it leads to destruction; nor did he ever deny the grandeur in the past of his own people, who bore the honourable name of "Israelites;" the people to whom belonged the adoption and the glory, the covenants and the law, the service of God and the promises, the patriarchs and the Messiah: while the nations of the heathen boast very different ancestors and customs.[2] None but a patriotic heart could break forth in the cry: "I say the truth, I lie not; my conscience also bearing me witness that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed for my brethren." One who speaks like this had a feeling for his people; and had not Paul spent himself in the service of Christ, he would undoubtedly have shed his blood with other Tarsians on the walls of Jerusalem in the year 70, and not in 64 upon the sand of the Roman arena.

Lastly, if we ask how far the circumstances of the busy and cultivated city of his birth, here enumerated, re-acted upon Paul's character, the influence upon his development of the Greek learning about him has been generally over-estimated. It is truer to say that the complete absence of Greek training in Paul clearly proves how sharp was the division between Jew and Gentile even in the Dispersion. In the house of a Pharisee especially—and such was the home of Paul—Greek literature was banned as bringing defilement. Thus in his youth he seems to have stood aloof from Greek literature; indeed, in later years, Greek writing is a difficulty to him, so that he generally dictates his letters; and when he does write, he laughs at his illegible Greek handwriting.[3] If, nevertheless, he has attained commendable dexterity in expressing himself in Greek, he gets it, not from the school of Tarsian grammarians and rhetoricians, who would have taught him more correct Greek, but from reading the Septuagint and continual intercourse with Greeks. If Hieronymus is right in finding traces of Cilician dialect in

[1] Gal. iv. 25. [2] Rom. ix. 1—5. [3] Gal. vi. 11.

Paul,[1] Tarsus would be proved the place where the Apostle received this branch at least of his education. On the other hand, his knowledge of Greek literature, as urged by some, certainly did not go far. In 1 Cor. xv. 53, Paul quotes an iambic trimeter from the Thais of Menander;[2] but he misses the run of the verse, and is guilty of a bad hiatus, which betrays only too clearly how unaccustomed his ear was to the euphony of Greek rhythm. The actual saying, too, "Evil communications corrupt good manners," is a Greek commonplace which no one learned from books. Paul is much more likely to have picked it up by chance in the streets, no less than the sentence which comes just before in his Epistle, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die," a saying which he may well have seen on the pedestal of Sandan's statue in the neighbouring Anchiale.[3] Menenius Agrippa's fable, too, of the war of the members one with another, he certainly did not get from Livy.[4] This scarcity of genuine classical quotations in a man who hardly writes a line without quoting, proves that Paul never had a Greek book beside him,[5] if we except the Apocrypha; and that later he laid aside this literature on principle, because after his conversion he felt it of prime importance to teach and know nothing but what came from the source of his religious knowledge; to be, in short, "simple" in the eyes of the learned.[6]

In the case of Paul, therefore, there is no question of the culture of the Greek school. However attractive as a writer, he had no suspicion of what the grammarians call grace. What an outcry the rhetoricians would have raised over the baldness of his favourite introductions to new paragraphs: "What shall we, then, say to these things?"[7] or his frequent forgetfulness of

[1] Hieron. Ad Alg. Quæst. 10, compared with 2 Cor. xi. 9 and xii. 13.

[2] Men. Thais, cf. Menandri Fragg. Meinecke, p. 75.

[3] See above, p. 5.

[4] Liv. ii. 32.

[5] Add the quotation from Aratus, Phænom. or Cleanthes, Hymn in Jov. in Acts xxvii. 28, and the verse from Epimenides, Tit. i. 12.

[6] 1 Cor. ii. 1, seq.

[7] Rom. viii. 31, &c.

"secondly" when he has begun with "firstly"! This does not imply that the Apostle was totally deficient in culture. His was the culture of the Hebrew, which recognizes other laws of beauty in style. Now Paul remained a Hebrew in his intercourse with Greeks, even when necessity made him a Greek author. His actual Greek Epistles prove that he thought in Hebrew all his life long, and that the voice which spoke to him on the way to Damascus spoke in Hebrew.[1] His syntax is Hebrew, so is his use of the particles; he often goes so far as to use words in the various senses of their Hebrew synonyms.[2] A play upon words, such as that between Sinai and Hagar, Gal. iv. 25, could only occur to a mind thinking in Hebrew, for which Sinai was simply hahar, the mountain.[3] His last speech in Jerusalem, *hebraidi dialecto*,[4] proves that, after his many years' work among the Greeks, the speech of Canaan still came easily to him.

We must therefore look for the school of the Apostle, not in the leafy alleys of the philosophers beside the Cydnus, where the scholars of the grammarians sat like waterfowl and intoxicated themselves on water, but solely in the Jewish quarter of Tarsus and the synagogue, where the barbarous philosophy of the Sophists seemed the wildest error of human intelligence. Paul's spirit was nourished on the culture supplied by every Jewish house, by the service in the synagogue and instruction from the Rabbis. Therefore he acknowledges himself to be no Hellenist, but a Hebrew of the Hebrews and a Pharisee after the law.[5]

[1] Acts xxvi. 14.

[2] So 1 Thess. v. 12, ἐρωτᾶν is used in the sense of "beg," because שָׁאַל means both "inquire" and "beg;" καλεῖν, Rom. iv. 17, in the sense of "rule," because קָרָא means "call" and "rule;" besides other examples.

[3] Gal. iv. 25.

[4] Acts xxii. 2. The same thing is proved by the fact of his continuing to reckon by the Jewish calendar in addressing Greeks. 2 Cor. viii. 10.

[5] Phil. iii. 4.

Yet it cannot be asserted that his upbringing in a Greek and cosmopolitan city was without influence on his development, nor that it was mere chance that Christianity received its greatest missionary from a city of the Dispersion. A cursory examination is enough to find on every page of the Pauline Epistles some trace of a writer who came to maturity in the stir and movement of a great city. The earliest impressions of youth are never outgrown; and if our spiritual individuality is the sum of our conceptions and the special form in which they are combined, we must not under-estimate the importance of such a birthplace upon later spiritual characteristics. Who could fail to see in the contrast between the Sermon on the Mount and the Pauline Epistles that the speaker in the Gospel creates his pictures from memories of the life of lake and mountain, plain and wood, while the writer of the Epistles grew up in the narrow streets of a great city, under the influence of the busy traffic crowding in from every quarter of the earth? As Jesus speaks to the people on the mountain, by the lake or in the rocky solitudes of the wilderness, so the son of the Jewish streets all his life long preferred the synagogue, the upper-chamber, or the quiet room in a remote quarter of the market-place. As the words of the Lord lash the leaders of the people and the sins of the great, so it is the sins of humbler folk and the secret vices of petty burgesses which Paul fights against. As Jesus shunned Jerusalem, so Paul sought the great cities, and brought the fresh air of Gennesareth with him into the sunless houses. Jesus drew his similes from nature; his preaching is filled with the scent of Galilean lilies, the twittering of birds under the open sky, the glow of the sunrise; Paul drew as many more from life within doors. His similes delight to touch the familiar surroundings of a Jewish house. The mazzoth and the lamb of the Passover, the mother with the child at her breast, the woman in travail, the dough on the hearth, furnish him with ready comparisons, and his own handicraft supplies the image when he compares consideration for the weaker brethren

with the custom of employing dress to bestow more abundant honour upon those members of the body which nature has made less honourable.

Undoubtedly Jesus' similitudes have a different atmosphere. The others betray the work-room in which they grew; and if Paul does attempt a different picture, as when in Rom. xi. 17 he makes the husbandman graft young shoots upon *old* olive-trees, the mistake proves the townsman and the Rabbi. Other similes are borrowed from the drill-ground, the armoury, the barrack, familiar to the townsman.[1] Paul even takes the shifting of scenes on the stage as a similitude for the great transformation impending over the world;[2] or he compares his life incidentally to a play in the amphitheatre, before an audience of men and angels.[3] It is clear from such comparisons how Gentile environment affected even "a Hebrew of the Hebrews," and introduced non-Jewish elements into his thought. A native of Palestine would hardly have compared life in God to a race-course, giving all the details of the contest, which the youthful aspirants enter upon after weeks of sober and chaste life, in pursuit of a crown which one alone can gain; or, again, in which they run and fight with bandaged eyes for the sport of the crowd, till at length the victor drags his prisoner bound to the gate, while the herald stretches himself and proclaims aloud the rules of the contest and the names of the victors, after a struggle from which he himself has wisely held aloof.

Such images also show plainly the greater freedom of mind enjoyed by Jews of the Dispersion in their judgment of heathen manners and customs.[4] The Jew of Palestine never in his life

[1] 1 Thess. v. 6, 8, 14. To the same category belong the simile of the triumph, 2 Cor. ii. 14, which leaves the scent of incense behind it; of the savour of death from the pestilence which settles in the narrow streets, ibid.; the pedlars, who adulterate their goods, 2 Cor. ii. 17; the ox and ass unequally yoked, 2 Cor. iii. 18.

[2] 1 Cor. vii. 31.

[3] 1 Cor. iv. 9.

[4] Thus precisely the same similes are to be found in Philo, Quod. Prob. Lib. l. c.

quitted his attitude of active and passive resistance to heathen customs, one and all. The author of the Apocalypse, driven to Ephesus by the stress of war, is filled with genuine indignation against the heathen customs which surround him, and we have seen elsewhere what opposition the Rabbis of Jerusalem offered to the introduction of heathen theatres and gymnasia. Even the enlightened author of the Fourth Book of Maccabees sees Jerusalem desecrated by the Syrians opening a "circus for naked youths" on Zion.[1]

Paul, on the contrary, whether in Ephesus, where he wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians, or Rome, where he wrote the Epistle to the Philippians, looked upon these contests in the theatre without the aversion of his Jewish contemporaries; nay, the words in which he recalls the foot-race, and the boxing, and the Isthmian crown of pine, betray a certain joy in the play of human strength and the exercise of natural capacities.[2]

His native city being recognized as the source of Paul's comparisons, there is in him, further, something of the townsman's quick sense, observing everything and comprehending everything, with eye and ear on the watch for customs or proverbs, of which, indeed, he has incorporated a considerable number, both Greek and Hebrew, in his writings.[3] But one thing above all must be reckoned among the moulding influences of his youth—his ability to converse with Greeks, and his extraordinary gift of tact in dealing with men of every stamp and every nationality. Although his family life was confined within narrow Jewish limits, a wider life was opened to him by the lively foreign commerce which permeated the city, by the independent institutions of political life, by repeated contact with different classes and nationalities, by the habit, from youth up, of moving with dignity and address among men of the most various kinds. All this engendered that knowledge of men,

[1] 4 Macc. iv.; cf. also 2 Macc. iv. 14, seq., with 1 Cor. ix. 24, seq.

[2] 1 Cor. ix. 24—26; Phil. iii. 12—14.

[3] 1 Cor. xii. 12; xv. 32, 33 (2 Thess. iii. 2).

that confidence of address, that capacity to direct, that gift for organization and for holding the threads of many affairs or supervising a hundred different interests, for multiplying yet not losing himself, which are so remarkable in Paul. They are gifts far more easily assimilated by one who is accustomed, from his earliest years, to the bustle of cities, than by the son of a country cottage, who is bewildered by such turmoil.

The name "Ecclesia," given to the Christian Church by Paul, was first heard by him in the agora of Tarsus, when the demos assembled to sanction the proposals of the senate. Is it likely that so powerful a mind should have learnt no more than its bare name from this striking institution? Assuredly it is no mere chance that the Apostle of the great cities was the tent-maker of Tarsus and not the fisherman of Capernaum. Though the most essential factors of his character must be sought for elsewhere, one certainly is traceable to Tarsus, namely his own breadth of view and ripeness of character, his address and confidence inspiring confidence. It was this induced the Jewish Sandedrin to repose important duties in his skilful hands; this made him the favourite messenger of the Christian Church, and sought after by all distracted or oppressed congregations.

But all this did not prevent Paul from being, as he often asserts, a son of the old belief in its special sense, a "Hebrew" to the backbone. It is a fact of the highest importance that Greek and Hebrew culture were not interfused in his native city as they were in Alexandria; otherwise he would probably have become an unfruitful and unproductive soul like so many of the degenerate offspring of that fusion. As it was, all that was noblest in the Semitic spirit crystallized in him hard and clear as diamond.

The vein of religion in which lay the greatness of Israel, re-appears in him as pure gold, untainted by any foreign element. National originality alone is productive, not a hybrid cross; it is by far the most frequent source of the self-unity necessary to produce a strong effect on others. This national view, infected

with no doubtings, the unadulterated Jewish faith, was Paul's own. This is why his words affected the course of history vastly more than all the Alexandrian writings put together. At the same time, the possibility of so quick an intelligence proceeding to appropriate certain Hellenistic, even certain Hellenic ideas, is not, of course, thereby excluded.

---

2. Jewish Education.

The orthodox Israelite and Roman citizen of the tribe of Benjamin, who was the father of Saul or Paul, belonged to the Jewish community of Tarsus, capable, courageous and conservative in belief, as we have seen it to be.[1] It may be inferred from the fact of the Apostle's father being a Roman citizen and yet an adherent of the strictest sect of Judaism, that he had the same outspoken, clear-cut character as his son displayed from the outset of his career. How he acquired his Roman citizenship is an ancient matter of discussion. May it not turn out that only the Acts ascribed this right to Paul? for as we know, the idea of his relation to Rome is here used on occasion to repel the charge that the Christians were enemies of the Roman empire. Meanwhile, many Tarsians possessed the citizenship,[2] and if, as is stated in the Acts, Paul could appeal to Cæsar, he, too, enjoyed it.

But in spite of this Roman citizenship, the family of the

[1] Phil. iii. 5. The information given by Hieronymus, Cat. Scr. Eccl. v., Comment. in Phil. xxiii., that Paul came to Tarsus with his parents from the little town of Gishala in Galilee, is contradicted by the express statement of Acts xxii. 3, which in any case relates an older tradition. The confusion of placing this change of domicile after the Jewish war, is not removed by referring it to the war of Varus; for the war *cum tota provincia Romana vastaretur manu et dispergerentur in orbe Judæi* can only be the war of Titus. This "myth" of the Father of the Church clearly springs from a time when every town in Palestine appropriated a saint with a view to pilgrimages.

[2] Dio Cass. xlvii. 31.

Apostle maintained the purity of their Jewish descent from the tribe of Benjamin. His father, and perhaps his grandfather before him, were Pharisees.[1] In the evening of his life the Apostle looks back, not without irony, on all that he used to be told of the superiority of his descent. He had been circumcised on the eighth day, in conformity with the law;[2] he was no Idumæan or half-Jew, but of the house of Jacob; nor from any of the renegade tribes, but from the one that remained faithful.[3] He was born a Hebrew of a purely Jewish marriage. His lips first uttered the language of Paradise, not that of the Gentiles. He was brought up according to the traditions of the Pharisees, and belonged to the energetic party of their school, the Zealots. All this he was taught to regard as "gain," but afterwards came to regard it as a disadvantage.

We know already what was the nature of this Jewish education which is to be assumed in the case of Paul.[4] At the age of five, the child of the Pharisee attended the reading of the Scriptures at home;[5] a little later, he went to the synagogue at the three hours of prayer, which signified to the Jews of the Dispersion the three daily sacrifices in the temple at Jerusalem. On Mondays, Thursdays and the Sabbath, there were expositions of the law to be listened to.[6]

Thus the scholar was gradually trained, first by the school, then by his own efforts as teacher. He read the law, tried his hand at exposition, and joined in controversy. Learning in the law was completed by attending exercises in catechism and disputation, and by ardour in transcribing the law. These preparations for office in the synagogue, or a seat and vote in the Sanhedrin, were given everywhere. In this way an energetic youth could rise to being ruler of the synagogue, or even archon

[1] Rom. xi. 1; Phil. iii. 4; 2 Cor. xi. 22; Gal. i. 14.
[2] Phil. iii. 4, after Gen. xvii. 12. [3] Ezra iv. 1.
[4] Cf. Time of Jesus, Vol. i. pp. 85—91 (Eng. trans.).
[5] Pirke Ab. v. 21. Filius quinque annorum ad biblia.
[6] Philo, De Septen. et Fest. M. 1178.

or ethnarch of the Jews, without giving up his father's home, his handicraft and his own family.

Thus every Jewish community was an altar of the true worship of God. In the case of Paul himself, we can see vividly how the obscurest Jewish quarter of the remotest city was quickened and peopled by the imperishable scenes and figures from the youth of mankind, how the stars of Abraham still shone in the heaven of a strange land, and the youngest Jewish child of the Dispersion was refreshed in spirit by the breeze that murmured in the grove of Mamre. Other poetic gifts he has none; yet how vividly he summons up before him the history of his forefathers. The patriarch Abraham, with whom God made a covenant because he believed, rises before his eyes.[1] To him, Hagar and Sarah, Ishmael and Isaac, are not colourless outlines, but the eternal types of humanity. To him, Israel's years of wanderings are a living scene;[2] he has pondered its least detail in all its bearings. He shows us (1 Cor. x.) the interminable procession of Israelites, overshadowed to the last man by the pillar of cloud. None were excluded from its protection, a point, indeed, which had given Paul food for thought. So, too, all traversed the Red Sea dry-footed, Corah's rebellious band no less than Joshua and Caleb, Zimri and Phineas. The spiritual feast of manna was showered upon all alike, the spiritual drink gushed from the miraculous rock for all.

Then he hears the stubborn people, untouched by so many tokens of favour, sigh after the fish and gherkins and melons, the leeks and the flesh, they once enjoyed in Egypt. He sees the Israelites encamp round the golden calf; he sees them eat and drink and stand up to dance; sees them hurry to Baal Peor and bring daughters of Midian into the camp. When at last they reach the goal of their wanderings, the spies come back with the news that the promised land is inhabited by giants, so that Israel begins to blaspheme against the sacred goal itself.

Thus the nation finds it a disadvantage to be the chosen

[1] Gal. iii. 6; Rom. ix. 9. [2] 1 Cor. x. 4, seq.

people; for, says Paul, God was not well pleased with the majority of those who had been thus miraculously guided. He sees them smitten down by the destroying angel; some lie fainting, others die of hunger; here men sink under the bite of serpents, there others are consumed by the sword; the angel of pestilence shoots his darts at the murmurers. But at last Israel reaches the goal: he sees six tribes stand on the barren rock of Ebal, six on the fertile Gerizim: he hears one company cry aloud the dark words of cursing, the other utter words of blessing as a promise of the Gospel.[1]

How inspiring a subject: how instinct with life. We may still, perhaps, see how it filled the boy's imagination with reveries and made his heart swell; for there are scenes that either live in youth or never, and such, in our opinion, were these meditations.

The depth of his interest in the Scriptures must be apparent to any who have examined a single epistle, and noticed how the Apostle's thought is thought in quotations. He has so impregnated himself with the Scripture that everything presents itself to him in Scripture forms. His knowledge, too, is complete and perfectly uniform. He quotes the Law as often as the Prophets, while among the sacred writers he has made the Psalmist especially his own.

That this "Hebrew of the Hebrews" nevertheless used the Greek Bible regularly, is hardly astonishing at a time when the original text always needed interpretation to the Jews. Josephus, the native of Jerusalem, is in the same position. Still Paul was not dependent on the Greek Bible; where the Hebrew text suits his argument better, he always comes back to it, while correcting various errors in the Septuagint.[2] Yet, as was the liberty of

[1] Gal. iii. 10.

[2] Thus Paul emends the translation of the LXX. in 1 Cor. xiv. 21 just so far as serves his purpose to make the prophecy of the stammering lips and strange tongues of the people, in Isaiah xxviii. 11, refer to the Christians' speaking with tongues. It is the same with the well-known passage, Gal.

the time, he also clung to the incorrect translation where this brought out his meaning more clearly.[1]

While, then, the Apostle was acquainted with the canon in both its forms, he is equally studious to follow the new sacred literature which we call the Apocrypha. The application of Deut. xxx. 11 in Rom. x. 6 is an echo of Baruch iii. 29. In particular, the Apostle has a wide knowledge of the Book of Wisdom, written in his own day, and perhaps not till after his conversion. The fact guarantees the study of other Hellenistic writings as well. Not only are parallels to be found here for his views that death came into the world through sin, and consequently through the devil,[2] or, again, that on the day of the Messiah the righteous Israelite shall judge the heathen,[3] or his censuring the representation of the Eternal God in earthly images;[4] but the dependence of his writings on such studies throws a striking light on his eagerness to "prove all things, hold fast that which is good."[5]

Various similes of the keen Alexandrian have been transferred to the Pauline Epistles,[6] e.g. the panoply of the faithful, who puts on righteousness as a breastplate, and true judgment as a

iii. 11, where the Apostle has an interest in restoring the correct reference of "faith" to the man who shall live, and not to Jehovah, as the LXX. wrongly translates Habak. ii. 11. He undertakes a similar emendation of Exod. ix. 16, to bring into relief his doctrine of predestination, Rom. ix. 17.

[1] Thus in 2 Cor. iv. 13 he employs the incorrect LXX. translation of Ps. cxvi. to find the profound saying, "I believed and therefore have I spoken," in words indifferent in themselves; or in Gal. iii. 16 draws inferences from the LXX.'s word σπέρματι (Gen. xii. 7) in the singular number, which are not in the least justified by the Hebrew זרע.

[2] Wisd. ii. 24.

[3] 1 Cor. vi. 2, cf. with Wisd. iii. 8.

[4] Rom. i. 23, cf. with Wisd. xiii. 13, 14. Cf. Lüdemann, Anthropologie d. Paulus, 119.

[5] 1 Thess. v. 21, v. 7, seq.; Rom. ix. 20, seq. Also the reference, Rom. i. 20, seq., to the revelation of God in the creation, is taken from Wisd. xiii. 5, 8. Cf. further Rom. i. 24 with Wisd. xiv. 21.

[6] Rom. ix. 21 with xv. 7; Rom. ix. 22 with xii. 20; Rom. xi. 32 with xi. 24; 2 Cor. v. 4 with Wisd. ix. 15; 1 Thess. iv. 13 with Wisd. iii. 18.

helmet, and sharpens his wrath for a sword;[1] or the potter who from the same clay moulds both the vessels that serve for clean uses and for the contrary.[2] Others, too, were read by Paul in Apocrypha lost to us, and sometimes cited with the prefatory formula, "The Scripture says." Thus, according to the opinion of the ancients, the proverb, "Neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature," comes from a lost "Apocalypse of Moses."[3]

Another of the Apocrypha lost to us must have contained the grand words of 1 Cor. ix. 10: "He that plougheth shall plough in hope, and he that thresheth in hope shall be partaker of his hope." Another must have supplied the words of 1 Cor. ii. 9: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath revealed unto us by his spirit."[4]

Besides these Greek Apocrypha, however, pithy sayings of the Rabbis attest the breadth of his education. "Not above that which is written;"[5] "If thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision:"[6] "All the law is fulfilled in one word, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself;"[7] "If any will not work, neither shall he eat;"[8]—are epigrammatic phrases, manifestly "sayings of the fathers," from their tone or likeness to other passages, and once more proving how true it is that an active spirit has many teachers.

Examining Paul's manner of using the Scripture in greater detail, it soon becomes clear that he received his understanding

[1] Wisd. v. 17. [2] Wisd. xv. 7.

[3] 1 Cor. vii. 19; Gal. v. 6, vi. 15. Cf. Syncell. Chron. p. 27, ed. Bonn, p. 48.

[4] Viz. an Apocalypse of Elias, according to Origen's testimony, in Matt. Com. 117. Cf. Fabric. Cod. Apocr. p. 342. Zachar. Chrysop. (Harm. Evang. p. 343) professes to have read the actual words in the above-named book. See the Commentary on 1 Cor. ii. 9.

[5] 1 Cor. iv. 6. [6] Rom. ii. 25. Parallels in Eisenmenger, ii. 239.

[7] Gal. v. 14.

[8] 2 Thess. iii. 10, if a Pauline nucleus is to be ascribed to this Epistle.

of it from the Jewish school. His quotations still bear to a great extent traces of the Rabbinical hands from which he received them. However much of the Rabbinical ingredients Paul rejected, the history of Israel presented itself to him differently in many respects from what we find it in the documents. Rabbinical glosses and expansions flow involuntarily from his pen; they are not contained in the text, but were familiar in the teaching of the Apostle from youth up, so that for the moment he is unable to decide which is the word of Scripture and which tradition.

To begin with the history of the Creation. It was a tradition of the Rabbinical school that the Adam of the first account of the creation (Gen. i.) was a different personality from the Adam of the second (Gen. ii.);[1] and Paul bases all his teaching concerning man and Christ upon this distinction.[2]

To proceed to the story of the Fall. Gen. iii. undoubtedly professes to explain the origin of evil in the world, i.e. to show why man must till a soil full of thorns and thistles, why woman must bear children in sorrow, why both are subject to death. Paul, on the contrary, conceives of this narrative as the explanation why a double law rules our members, and the law of death rules our inner man. Kindred thoughts recur in the book of Enoch and the Wisdom of Solomon,[3] and it scarcely admits of doubt that here, again, the exegesis of his school determined his view. So, too, he points to a fall through sin on the part of the angels, his opinion being that they were seduced by the beauty of women.[4]

Proceeding to the history of the patriarchs, Paul, according to Rom. iv. 5, 13, shares the opinion of the Jubilees that Abraham

[1] Philo, De Opif. Mundi, Mang. i. 32; Leg. Alleg. 49.

[2] Rom. v. 12, seq.; 1 Cor. xv. 21, seq., 47, seq.; Phil. ii. 6.

[3] Enoch lxix. 11, seq., xcviii. 4, 5. Also Dillmann, p. 12; Wisd. i. 13, 14, ii. 23, 24.

[4] 1 Cor. xi. 10. Cf. the Targum on Gen. vi. 2.

was an idolater before his conversion,[1] and that he received the promise of inheriting the earth, neither of which stands in the text of Scripture. So Gal. iv. 23, asserts that Isaac was not begotten after the flesh, but by the creative word of God.[2] Paul represents the patriarch's youth as troubled by persecutions of Ishmael.[3] These are not known to Scripture, but to the Book of Jubilees, which tells how Ishmael allured his half-brother into the fields, shot at him with arrows, dragged him about, and ill-treated him under pretence of playing with him. The opinion of the Apostle seems also to be that it was one of Satan's angels who wrestled with Jacob in the shape of an angel of light,[4] a view equally far from the text.

The story of Moses is one which Paul saw most decidedly through the medium of Rabbinical tradition; it is one indeed, as is clear from Philo's and Josephus' biographies of the lawgiver, where legendary embellishment was especially rife. Thus we read in 1 Cor. x. 4, that the rock from which Moses smote forth water was not a natural rock, but the Messiah, who followed the train of the children of Israel in this semblance; whereas in the meditations of the Rabbis the rock figures as rolling after the wandering people through the sandy waste to give them drink.[5] Further, in 1 Cor. x. 1, the statement that God went before Israel as a fire by night and a pillar of cloud by day,[6] is interpreted as if the divine *Shechinah* had overshadowed the whole train of Israelites; indeed, Paul assumes that water fell from this cloud to baptize the children of Israel unto Moses. The statement, in Gal. iii. 19, that the law was proclaimed on Mount Sinai by angels, accords with Rabbinical and Samaritan theo-

[1] Cf. Time of Jesus, Vol. i. p. 109 (Eng. trans.).

[2] Cf. Rom. iv. 19, ix. 9. Jubil. Götting. Jahrb., 1850, s. v.; S. Beresch, R. 53, 15.

[3] Gal. iv. 29.

[4] 2 Cor. xi. 14.

[5] Onkelus in Numb. xxi. 18—20. Cf. the Commentary on 1 Cor. x. 4.

[6] Exod. xiii. 21.

logy;[1] and presumably the further inquiry, in 2 Cor. iii. 2—16, as to whether the reflection of the divine glory was extinguished, or continued to shine on Moses' face under the veil which he put on as he came down from Sinai, was the subject of Rabbinical controversy.

In this way the Scripture narratives, viewed through the prism of Rabbinical tradition, appeared to the Apostle with bright edges of divers colours, and lost their clearness of outline. In general, however, the background of his thought was formed by the ideas of the Rabbis. Paul counts the third heaven as above the clouds, the seventh as paradise;[2] and with regard to demonology and eschatology, completely shares the common ideas of Judaism, such as we have already met with in the Apocalypse.

While Paul, then, read the Scriptures under the influence of Rabbinical tradition and the scheme of things held by contemporary Judaism, individual points in his exposition of Scripture also show clear traces of his school of exegesis. His attitude towards Scripture, thus determined by his school, presents itself firstly in his strong theory of inspiration. In his eyes, the Scripture is but the phenomenal form of the Divine Spirit, so that he speaks of it as of a living being. The Scripture "foresees,' "concludes,"[3] "enjoins," "speaks," "is not contrary,"[4] and makes disposition with regard to the future.[5] In other words, like the authors of the Apocrypha, the Apostle holds the Scripture to be Wisdom revealed to view in the book of the law. It is identical with God; the expressions, "the Scripture says" and "God says" are the same.

Paul therefore does not hesitate to attach most important consequences to the most trifling particulars in the Scripture. After

[1] So the LXX., Deut. xxxiii. 2. Rabbinical passages in Schöttgen and Wetstein on Gal. iii. 19; Delitsch on Heb. ii. 2; Joseph. Ant. xv. 5, 3.

[2] 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4. Cf. Schöttgen, Hor. p. 718, seq.; Eisenmeng. Entd. Judenth. i. 460; Rev. ii. 7; Enoch xxv. 1.

[3] Gal. iii. 22. [4] Gal. v. 23. [5] Gal. iv. 23—25.

his separation from Lot (Gen. xiii. 15), Abraham receives the promise of the land of Canaan for himself *and his seed.* From this word *seed,* used in the singular by the LXX., Paul draws the far-reaching inference that the Messiah is here meant, the *one* Abrahamid, and not the multitude of the people of Abraham.[1] From this identification of the Divine Spirit and the Scripture, arises further the exclusiveness of the proof from Scripture. Proof by reasoning is only found incidentally in Paul.[2] His method of proof is quite that of the Rabbinical school, which always prefers authoritative proof by quotation to the direct conclusions of reason; and instead, as it were, of attaining its object by a single stride over the stream, steps slowly from stone to stone, and, after extraordinary divagations, arrives where a simple argument from reason and experience would have brought it sooner. The upshot is, that not reason, but the Scripture, should decide in matters of faith; and thus Paul did not write a single sentence without immediately basing it upon the Scripture; while texts upon texts are strung together into sorites in a manner found nowhere else but in the Talmud.

Besides this community of method, however, we see Paul making use of certain essentially Hellenistic ideas which characterize his conception of the world more deeply. Foremost among these comes the doctrine of a double meaning in the Scriptures; one for ordinary comprehension, the other a deeper spiritual meaning, with its dependent conception that certain occurrences in ancient history were prophetic types of future events. The supposition of a double meaning in Scripture and the habit of allegorical explanation had also made their way into the schools

[1] Gal. iii. 16. Deutsch, Talmud, p. 39, adduces a kindred Rabbinical passage in which the Rabbis refer the words of Jehovah, "The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground," to the fact that the murderer was made responsible for all life, not only for that which he had destroyed; because in Gen. iv. 10, the word "blood" is used in the plural (דְּמֵי אָחִיךָ), not the singular.

[2] So 1 Cor. xi. 14, ix. 4—13, where Paul, however, expressly adds that he only speaks *κατ' ἄνθρωπον,* and consequently set no value on such reasons.

of the Hebrews, for they are everywhere the necessary consequence of an overstrained theory of inspiration. But the mind can never wholly renounce its independence. If, then, it is hampered by the opinion that truth is unconditionally contained in a holy Scripture, it will still read its own thought into this Scripture, and from the Scripture again explain away all that contradicts its thought by interpreting certain elements as pictorial, as unessential or simply allegorical.

We have seen before how Hellenism came to seek a deeper spiritual meaning behind the plain words of the text. Touching this, Philo lays down the principle that the law did not deal with unreasonable beings, but always had in view those endowed with reason and sense; and so, too, Paul declares in 1 Cor. ix. 9 that God does not take care for oxen, interpreting the fine precept (Deut. xxv. 4) against muzzling the ox that treads out the corn as declaring the right of God's preachers to claim the means of subsistence from the churches.

In the same way that Philo translated the patriarchs into virtues, Paul interpreted their wives as covenants. In the strife between the two women, Sarah and Hagar, he only sees an allegorical representation of the relation between the old and the new covenant. This is not an ordinary history, says Paul, in Gal. iv. 24; it has a deeper allegorical meaning. Hagar is the covenant of Sinai, as the learned in the law would see at a glance from the name of the mountain, called Hadshar by the Arabians. It answers in reality to the servitude of Jerusalem, which, like Hagar, is for the time a slave. On the other hand, the free woman, Sarah, signifies the new covenant, the heavenly Jerusalem, which is free. The proof of this is found by Paul in Isaiah liv. 1, where the Jerusalem which is to be rebuilt is spoken of by the prophet in terms which apply equally well to Sarah: "Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child; for more are children of the desolate than the children of the married wife." If the new Jerusalem is here represented as

Sarah, childless and yet rich in children, conversely Sarah is merely an allegory of the new covenant. But if Hagar and Sarah signify the old and new covenant, then their children Ishmael and Isaac signify the children of the old and the new covenant, i.e. Jews and Christians, or unbelieving and believing Israel. Hence the Christians are persecuted by the Jews as Ishmael persecuted his brother. But the end of the allegory, "Cast out the son of the servant; he shall not inherit with the son of the free woman," clearly signifies what is to be the end of the strife between Jew and Christian.

Similarly, in Rom. x. 6, the Apostle treats the righteousness by faith of Deut. xxx. 11—14 as a deeper meaning of the Scripture, not understood by Moses himself. In fact, he contrasts Moses with righteousness by faith. Moses, he says, writes in Lev. xviii. 5 of righteousness by the law, "which, if a man do, he shall live in them." But of righteousness by faith, Deut. xxx. 12 says: "Say not, Who shall go up for us to heaven and bring it unto us," &c. Now according to the principles of the Rabbis, both the former and the latter were written by Moses; Paul therefore considers that in the second passage the lawgiver imparted something, the deeper meaning of which he did not understand.

Again, in Rom. iv. 23—25, Paul declares it was said of Abraham that his faith was imputed unto him for righteousness; and it was written, not for his sake alone, but also for us, to whom it shall be imputed. It was therefore written primarily, indeed, for Abraham; but the Scripture already entertained the purpose, unknown to Moses, of extending the same grace to the Christians.

Just as Paul deals with the doctrine of the deeper meaning of Scripture, as a long-established method of exegesis, so, further, he deals with the idea of the *type*, another essential aid to the scriptural exposition of his time.

Now the idea of the type implies that events or persons were at the same time emblems of men or things destined to appear

hereafter in fuller perfection. The Melchizedek of antiquity lived indeed, but was essentially a prophecy of Jesus, the future priest-king. God only created him to point the way to something higher, wherein the prophetic element in himself would be fulfilled. This conception, moreover, is unmistakably Hellenic in its origin, based upon the Platonic scheme of the world. In Platonism everything is a type, i.e. moulded after the idea which some day we shall behold in the fields of truth. But now Judaistic Hellenism identified the world of ideas and the kingdom of the Messiah. In the Jewish view, the world of ideas will descend in the last days; the heavenly Adam, the heavenly Jerusalem, the heavenly heaven will become actually visible when the hour of fulfilment comes; meantime, they cast their shadows upon this world of sense. The earthly Jerusalem is the impression, or, in the words of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the shadow of the heavenly; and in so much as the Jerusalem above will some day descend from heaven, it is a promise of what is to come. Melchizedek is a copy of the heavenly high-priest; in so much as this heavenly high-priest will one day actually come upon earth, he is a prophecy, a type, a prophetic emblem. Thus, too, the first Adam is a type of the heavenly Adam; in so much as this heavenly Adam will come in person as the second Adam, the type contains a prophecy of the prototype.

This Platonic view translated into Judaism means, therefore, that somewhere in the future the ideal world will realize itself in the Messianic kingdom. All copies, shadows or types, are therefore portraits of "what shall come to pass." They are premonitions, the shadows which coming events cast before them, thus prefiguring in the manner of prophecy what will only be realized later. But according to Paul, God has put typical events of this kind before our eyes that later generations may take warning by them. The wandering of the Israelites in the wilderness, their baptism in the cloud and the sea, their food the manna, and their sacred drink from the rock of Christ, all appeared, according to 1 Cor. x., as a prophetic admonition

to the future Church, which should come forth from Egypt, be born anew by water and the Spirit, and be fed to everlasting life by the bread and cup of heaven. "These things happened for our examples," says Paul.

Their lusting after the flesh-pots of Egypt was once more a shadow and type of things to come, for the later Christians, too, lusted after the old privileges of their heathen temples. They worshipped the golden calf to prefigure the relapse of some from Christ into heathenism. They went astray with the daughters of Moab, even as lost Christians should some day go after the worship of the Pandemos. They were pierced with the sword for their discontent, to exemplify the fate of discontented Christians. In short, "all these things," Paul says, "happened unto them for ensamples; and they are written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come."

One more point, in particular, shows how deeply Paul was penetrated and dominated by this subtle idea of all the past being a prophecy of the fulness of time, that the history of God's people was but the shadow cast upon earth by the kingdom of heaven before descending. Very real institutions of the old covenant frequently appear to him as symbolical indications whereby the Spirit of God shows, in forms of sense, what shall come to pass hereafter. He is capable, therefore, of plunging deep into speculation upon the undeciphered symbols which, from the beginning, pointed to him who has since come. Thus the Paschal lamb is a promise of the victim who was slain on the day of preparation for the Passover; the unleavened bread is a type of the spiritual purity in which the Church of the Lamb has its life; the casting out of the leaven is a type of the casting out of sin from the household of Christendom. Similarly we find a more crude and downright application of allegory and type, yet the same method, in the book of Aristeas, where the prohibition against eating birds of prey signifies to the adept that righteousness and moderation are the will of God; animals with cloven feet may be eaten because their feet signify the

severance between the heathen and the people of the covenant; and the permission to eat creatures that chew the cud typifies the blessing of recollection of the law.

Here, then, we come again upon matter derived from the Jewish schools; moreover, Paul agrees with the Rabbis in treating the deeper and spiritual sense of the Scripture as something esoteric, which can only be imparted "to them that are perfect."[1] Indeed, he actually distinguishes between exoteric and esoteric elements as milk and meat, the same image as was used by the Rabbis and Philo.[2]

There is a strong flavour of the schoolmen in all this; in essence, nevertheless, it is no more than could be found in any intelligent Israelite who had been trained from childhood in the Scripture, and had closely followed the expositions of the teachers and the course of the disputations in the synagogue. In Paul, however, there exist elements of cultivation belonging to a more advanced stage; betraying, in fact, the special training of the Scribe. The Acts calls him a pupil of the Rabbis; and he says of himself that he surpassed many of his equals among the Jews in eagerness for the traditions of their fathers;[3] or, as he expresses it in the Epistle to the Philippians, "as touching the law, a Pharisee." He is therefore to be accredited with more than the usual Jewish education; and this surplus is to be found in his Epistles.

---

3. Paul as Lawyer and Pharisee.

The manner in which Paul speaks of his education after the law in the Epistle to the Philippians, leaves it an open question whether he received this education in Tarsus or Jerusalem. In the next century, however, the Acts is able to state that Paul

[1] As is shown by the formula with which in 1 Cor. x. 1 he elucidates the typical meaning of the history of Israel, and in 1 Cor. ii. 6 expressly explains it.

[2] 1 Cor. iii. 2. Cf. Philo, De Agricult. Mang. p. 301. [3] Gal. i. 14.

came early to Jerusalem and was "brought up in this city."[1] Now as the story of Paul's appearance at the trial of Stephen follows immediately upon this statement, it seems as though Paul's pre-Christian period belongs essentially to the capital of Judaism, and as though he had proceeded straight from the school to join in the persecution of the Christians, since the Acts expressly mentions him as a youth at this occurrence.

But this insistence on his youth perhaps belongs to the apologetic tendency of the book, which pleads the youth of Stephen's judge, regardless of the fact that Paul could hardly have been a youth in 36, if he describes himself in the Epistle to Philemon as an old man in 60.[2]

Now the very part played by Paul in the persecutions precludes the unripeness of youth. In Judaism, particularly, where it was an established principle that wisdom was only to be found in the old, a mission of such responsibility as the extirpation of Christianity in Damascus would never have been entrusted to a "youth" in our sense of the word.[3] But if it may be taken that the apologetic tendency of the Acts has generally affected the representation of Paul's youth, it is a pertinent question whether the same desire to commend him to Judæo-Christians, which determined the Acts to make him closely connected with the primitive community, to give him teachers "blameless according to the law,"[4] and to ascribe to him five pilgrimages to Jerusalem and two Nazirite vows, did not also give rise to that legend of his youth, which states that he was brought up in the holy city and educated at the feet of the gentle Gamaliel.

Apart from the fact that in the next century, when nothing

[1] Acts xxii. 3. His relations there, xxiii. 16.

[2] Philem. 9, *πρεσβύτης*.

[3] When Paul (Gal. i. 14) says that he excelled all his *συνηλικιώτας* in the Jews' religion, he speaks of a time seventeen years before; but it is not necessary to take the word "equals" in the sense of playfellows or childish companions, for *ἡλικία* is each age, and *ἡλικιώτης* can stand in the sense of *contemporaries*.

[4] Acts xxii. 12.

but legend was known of the youth of Jesus, it is hardly likely that truer recollections existed of the Apostle's youth, there are very considerable reasons against assuming that Paul was in Jerusalem *before* the persecution of Stephen, and belonged there to the school of Gamaliel. Granted that our materials do not allow of any certain conclusions, still it is noteworthy that Paul, who made the proceedings of the year 36 his life-long reproach, considers himself entirely blameless for those of the year 35. He never saw Jesus, as he must if he had taken part in the fatal Passover, for he speaks in 2 Cor. v. 16 of those who had known Jesus in the flesh as boasting a superiority over him. Nor did he stand among the crowd who cried, "Crucify him! crucify him!" His conscience is free from the rejection of the Messiah, or there would be no lack of self-reproach. As it is, he reproaches the princes of this world for crucifying the Lord of glory.[1] Consequently he was blameless of any share in the matter; but how could he have been in Jerusalem without declaring himself on this question, the one of all others that stirred his own party? We should have to ask him, with the disciple of Emmaus: "Art thou only a stranger in Jerusalem, and hast not known the things which are come to pass there in these days?"

It is always possible, indeed, that a chance absence during the eventful Passover spared the Apostle from sharing the guilt of the Messiah's blood. But his silence refers to all the previous history of the preaching of the kingdom as it had stirred Palestine from the year 34 onwards.

The vigorous Baptist movement also left no impression on him. As for the Baptist, whom Jesus ranked so high, Paul never so much as mentions him. In every branch of evangelistic tradition, the origin of the gospel is John the Baptist; but Paul knows of no relation to him, either direct or indirect. Could such a movement as then started from Judæa and swept through Samaria and Galilee have left no deeper traces upon the spirit

[1] 1 Cor. ii. 8; also 1 Thess. ii. 15.

of the Apostle if at the time he had been in Jerusalem or even Judæa? It is scarcely conceivable.

Paul, too, invariably represents his first contact with Christ as arising from his persecution of the already existing Church. His adherence to Judaism did not consist in his rejection of the Messiah, but in his attack upon the Church.[1] Of temper so severe in judging his past, he would not have been silent if lying under the reproach of resistance to the Baptist, if he had lifted up his voice with the generation of vipers against the prophet by the banks of Jordan, or had helped other Pharisees to fabricate charges against Jesus, and, like them, had preferred Barabbas to the Messiah. Had he wished to be silent, we know how good a memory his adversaries had for his past. The fact that even they nowhere urge this against him proves that Paul took no share either in the opposition to the Baptist or in the Pharisees' strife against Jesus.

In all probability, therefore, he was not in Jerusalem at all during 34 and 35. What, then, becomes of the assertion that he was brought up at Jerusalem and was educated at the feet of Gamaliel? In later times he always regards Tarsus, not Jerusalem, as the home to which he returns; he is everywhere "unknown by face"[2] in Judæa; his handicraft is the one that has its home in Tarsus and its name from Cilicia. The assertion is, to say the least, unsupported by these facts, while what we know of Gamaliel is entirely opposed to it. The Acts itself and the ordinances ascribed to Gamaliel the elder in the Mishna, show him as the man of mildness, of gentle methods, of unruffled patience; Paul, on the contrary, calls himself a Zealot, and his assertion is borne out by the Acts.[3] Now the difference between Gamaliel and the Zealots was not a division merely within the same school. The Zealot was no disciple of Gamaliel, but of Shammai, the opponent alike of him and his grandfather. Shammaites and Hillelites, or, to speak in the words of the Gospel, Zealots and Herodians, are opposed to one another; and while Gamaliel,

[1] Gal. i. 13, 14. [2] Gal. i. 22. [3] Gal. i. 14; Phil. iii. 5.

appointed chief of the Sanhedrin by Herod Agrippa, represents the Pharisaic tendency to follow the example of the pattern king and aims at harmony with the Gentiles, the name of Zealot betokens bitter resistance to every form of heathenism.

We are already acquainted with the precepts ascribed to Gamaliel by the Talmud.[1] These made him out by no means zealous for the traditions of the fathers, like his reputed disciple. While the latter describes himself as more zealous for the tradition of the teachers than many others, we still possess this wise saying of Gamaliel's: "Tithe not overmuch on conjecture"—a motto that clearly shows the idea of his theology, namely, to purge Pharisaism of its over-scrupulousness.[2] The same tendency is to be seen in Gamaliel's synedrial ordinances. There are regulations to facilitate divorce, to prevent annoyance of those who had been divorced, to secure the fortune of widows, and to make second marriages easier both for widows and divorced women by relieving them of troublesome formalities. The Sabbath-day's journey is liberally defined for the benefit of the country people who wished to return home from Jerusalem to their neighbouring villages; not to mention other milder interpretations of the Hillelite school re-introduced by Gamaliel.

He is also accredited, more or less reasonably, with a series of regulations which permitted the Gentile poor to glean in Jewish fields, allowed the Gentile the greeting of peace even when on the way to the idolatrous temple, besides other tolerant decrees which might curb the eagerness of the Zealots.

Further, Gamaliel was a decided Herodian. Herod Agrippa II. had made him president of the Sanhedrin, so that he is the representative of the party friendly to Rome,[3]—the very party, therefore, opposed to the Zealots and ready to come to terms with the Gentiles contrary to the traditions of their fathers. All

[1] Cf. Derenbourg, Pal. xv. p. 239, seq.

[2] Grätz, Gesch. des Judenth. iii. 274; Sepp, Leben Jesu, 179, 198; Derenbourg, Pal. 239, seq.

[3] Derenbourg, l. c.

the hatred of the Shammaites against Hillel was consequently transferred to Gamaliel. It is well known how in the Jewish war the Pharisees, with this tendency to compromise, were assailed by the Zealots with all the horrors of war. How, then, can Paul have been a Zealot, how can he go so far as to call himself a Zealot beyond his contemporaries, or say that he excelled all in the Jew's religion in eagerness for the traditions, if he really was the disciple of the man who was cried down for his laxity, for his inclination to lighten the burden of the law and make the tradition of no avail by his mild interpretations?[1] We must not even overlook the detail that in the Talmud Gamaliel orders the targum of the book of Job to be burnt, while Paul quotes the book as canonical.[2]

Moreover, the account of Paul's previous history does not stand in the narrative portion of the Acts, where the writer works from documents, but in one of those speeches peculiar to himself in which he generally gives expression to the apologetic tendencies of his book. All the more reason for suspecting that the writer named the best known Jewish Rabbis as Paul's teachers, and especially the one whose name sounded best in Christian ears, and who remained the longer in remembrance because his grandson, Gamaliel II., chief of the school of Jamnia, still kept his memory alive in the second century. The upshot is, that the account of the Apostle's youth, as it stands, is impugned by considerations of more than ordinary weight. The probability is that Paul was *not* educated as a Pharisee in Jerusalem, but came there a zealous Pharisee already, to plunge at once into the vortex of party strife, whence, after a brief delirium, he emerged a Christian.

Such being the case, the source of the Apostle's Rabbinical training must instead be sought in the synagogue of the Cilician Jews. The local importance of the Jews ensures the existence of such a synagogue somewhere on the banks of the Cydnus.

[1] Cf. generally the part played by the word ζῆλος in Paul; Rom. x. 2; 1 Cor. iii. 3; 2 Cor. vii. 7, xi. 2, xii. 20; Phil. iii. 6; Gal. v. 20.

[2] Derenbourg, l. c.

Nothing indeed is known of its teachers, its numbers or its proselytes; but in a synagogue so strongly nationalist in character, the Pharisaic element must certainly have been strongly represented, and Paul and his father would not have been the only members of this party.

How far, then, does the current of his spiritual life and strenuous ideas spring from Jewish sources? At what point is it lost in the new current which sets in with his conversion? This is not so difficult to extract from his existing Epistles, for the schooled jurist and Rabbi is visible in them as well as the former Pharisee. In the first place, a study of the Scriptures such as we must assume in Paul, was at the same time a constant study of the law. In a theocracy, God decides. The lawyer, therefore, is he who has knowledge of God's word. Now the Epistles of Paul show, both directly and indirectly, that he studied the Scripture from this practical point of view, as to what, namely, was lawful among his people.

Considering this more closely, we are at once struck by the strongly legal tendency of his thought, the quantity of legal expressions, and the frequent reference to peculiarities of the Jewish law. The whole of the Apostle's doctrine of justification from guilt incurred, which God cannot pardon unless it has been atoned for by some objective satisfaction, is founded on principles of law no less than of theology. In particular, also, his images are very often taken from the domain of legal relations. He says, for instance, in 2 Cor. i. 22, that God has sealed us and given the arrabon or earnest-money of the spirit in our hearts. God, as it were, on calling us has made a payment on account, so that He cannot draw back without prejudice; nay, He has even sealed the contract.

Similarly, election is in Paul's eyes an "inheritance"[1] or "covenant"[2] confirmed by both parties. For him, Christ's death is, in relation to the law, an "end of tutelage," when old claims cease.[3] On the legal principle that a contract cannot be altered by one

[1] Gal. iv. 1, iii. 18. [2] Gal. iii. 17. [3] Gal. iv. 2.

party to it only, he denies the obligation of the law, which was only added 430 years later to the covenant between Abraham and God.[1] According to the legal ideas of the East, he could speak of the heir under age as being devoid of rights like a slave,[2] because neither is *sui juris*. This is the argument of Gal. iv. 1. The heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant. Even the saying, "If we are sons, then we are heirs," recals the Jewish rights of inheritance, which partially excluded daughters from the inheritance.[3] A Jew with less instruction in the law would probably have written: "If we are children, then heirs." We find a similar legal detail from the department of marriage-rights in Rom. vii. 2, seq., where the argument proceeds from the legal principle that a woman is only bound during the life-time of her husband.

Elsewhere, too, the old lawyer incidentally breaks out in Paul, as in the unusual vehemence with which he attacks the habit of the Corinthian Christians[4] to go to law before Gentile judges, contrary to the strict command of the Rabbis; while the only sentence of condemnation we read in him is an old official formula from the days of the Sanhedrin, cited by him in the customary form of Rabbinical law: "Put away from among yourselves that wicked person" (Deut. xvii. 7).[5]

The Rabbinical education traditionally ascribed to Paul is therefore justified in fact: and it is equally just to recognise, in its effects upon him, his attachment to the Pharisaic party, supported as it is by his own testimony.

That such a personality as Paul could be a Pharisee with heart and soul,—and that after all disillusions he was still able to bear witness to the zeal of the Zealots that it was a zeal for God and therefore worthy of all sympathy,[6]—confirms the view already brought forward in these pages as to the aims and value of Pharisaism. Pharisaism in those days contained all the nobler spirits, all who were in earnest with the faith of Israel;

[1] Gal. iii. 15. [2] Gal. iv. 1. [3] Gal. iv. 7.
[4] 1 Cor. vi. 1. [5] 1 Cor. v. 13. [6] Rom. x. 2.

with hardly an exception, it was left to the self-seeking of the priests and the indifference of the common herd to walk in other ways. In his fundamental principles Paul clung so tenaciously to the views of his school that, as late as the year 59, according to the account in the Acts,[1] he could appeal to the Pharisees of the Sanhedrin: "Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee; of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question." This means that the expectation of the near approach of the "kingdom," which was the religious atmosphere of Pharisaism, remained as the great hope and purport of his life as well as theirs. What we find in him is not the Essene's hunger for purity, not the Sadducee's fanaticism for the temple, but the characteristic temper of the Pharisees, with their imagination of the things to come, their eager watch for the signs of the times, their tense expectation of the approaching end and judgment of the whole world, and of the resurrection and the glory of the Messiah.[2]

All the other views, the reality of which was hotly contested between Pharisees and Sadducees, belief in direct intercourse with a supersensuous world, in angelic visions, heavenly voices, marvellous signs and powers, and revelations of every kind, made up the spiritual world from whose dominion Paul never got free. He grew up in this conviction, and searches the Scriptures because it was written "for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come. Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall."[3] The history of mankind is a measure that grows full; and this measure needs but a few drops more to make it overflow.[4]

Nothing shows more clearly the height to which the apocalyptic temper of this generation could rise, than his declarations that it is scarcely worth while to free others, or to be set free;

[1] Acts xxiii. 6.

[2] Cf. Time of Jesus, Vol. i. p. 145 (Eng. trans.); Lipsius, Der Ap. Paulus, in the Jahrb. das Deutschen Prot. Ver. 1869, p. 60.

[3] 1 Cor. x. 11.

[4] 1 Thess. iii. 16.

that it is wiser to endure bondage for the short time longer in order to receive a higher reward, "for the time is short; it remaineth that both they that have wives be as though they had none; and they that weep, as though they wept not; and they that rejoice, as though they rejoiced not; and they that buy, as though they possessed not; and they that use this world, as not abusing it; for the fashion of this world passeth away."[1] Thus tears brought him no bitterness, and joy no sweetness, on the eve of the last day. He wishes that there might be no more marrying, for this generation is assuredly the last.[2]

Such at this time was the view of many eager Zealots. Years before the outbreak of the great Jewish war, a popular prophet at Jerusalem, Joshua ben Anan, was never weary of raising his mournful dirge over the "Bride and Bridegroom."[3] He, too, did not believe there was time for marrying before the coming of the great day of wrath.

Paul in the same way does not hesitate to invoke the approach of the great calamity even in purely practical questions; confronted by petty ambitions, he demands whether men would occupy themselves with such concerns on the day of the Messiah.[4] To him, as to the Essene and Pharisee, the religious duty of Israel is limited to the tense expectation of the Messiah; he even confesses, "All prophets have prophesied of nothing else but of the days of the Messiah."[5] Nay, more: in sympathy with the profoundest spirits among his people, Paul is conscious of a yearning for redemption which even embraces the material world. As the Scribes dreamed of a coming glorification of earthly nature, which, with thorns and thistles and all creatures, is for man's sins subject to the curse of a painful existence and death and decay, until the Messiah shall restore it to the glory of Paradise, so Paul, too, hopes for a day when the whole crea-

[1] 1 Cor. vii. 29, seq.

[2] 1 Cor. vii. 6.

[3] Bell. vi. 5, 3.

[4] 1 Cor. iii. 15.

[5] Time of Jesus, Vol. i. p. 163 (Eng. trans.).

tion shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption.[1] And here we see how the eschatological expectation is coloured with Jewish ideas even more deeply than in the Gospels, so that we are almost reminded of the dreams of universal transformation in the book of Enoch. Herein, indeed, consists the underlying Pharisaism of Paul's consciousness, which he maintained to the last as the basis of his scheme of the world.

In contradiction to this firmly-rooted assurance that the Messianic time was now close at hand and the kingdom of heaven had begun to dawn, stood certainly the prior belief of the Pharisees, that their petty arts and subtleties in fulfilling the law were indispensable for ushering in the day of Jehovah. But this contradiction was pre-existent, as the law expressly made the fulfilment of the promise depend upon the fulfilment of the law. None but a righteous people might inherit the kingdom. So it was but natural that the quarrel, often referred to by Josephus, should break out between the three Jewish parties, as to whether man has the power to bring about his own righteousness or whether this also is God's concern.[2] The Essenes' denial of all human freedom, making every event dependent on God's omnipotence, is thoroughly in harmony with their belief that God would bring the kingdom immediately.

God, then, in answer to the prayers of the saints, will speedily bring to pass both the righteousness of the people—that is, the new heart in place of the heart of stone—and the fulfilment of the promise. Even now His is both will and performance, and He fashioneth some to vessels of honour, others to vessels of dishonour; for human volition cannot stand before His omnipotence.

[1] The sources of this side of the expectation of the kingdom are to be looked for in Isaiah xi. 6—8, lxv. 17, lxvi. 1; Ps. cii. 27. Cf. Eisenmeng., Entd. Judenth. ii. 367, seq., 824, seq.; Schoettg., Hor. Hebr. ii. 71, 76. This tradition is the source drawn upon by Paul when he says, "We know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now." Rom. viii. 22.

[2] Cf. Time of Jesus, Vol. i. p. 148 (Eng. trans.).

This view also was afterwards adopted by Paul. As an Apostle, his doctrine of election by grace did but shake off the incompleteness and inconsistency of the Pharisaic teaching, which thought to harmonize divine grace with the necessity of human fulfilment of the law. But this was the very point in which his own testimony shows that he then sought the true "Judaism." He, too, tormented himself more than others with the judgments of the school, and maintained the necessity of fulfilling the "whole law." He was a zealot for these judgments, for others must not be allowed to shake off the fetters that bound himself so strictly.

But it was precisely this strict rule of the law, interfering at every step even in the most natural actions of material and spiritual life, which invested things with a power of allurement and temptation they would never have had apart from their prohibition. In Rom. vii. 7, the Apostle notes the fact with keen self-criticism: "Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin but by the law; for I had not known lust except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence: for without the law sin was dead .... for sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me and by it slew me."

Paul's experience was the experience of ascetics in all ages. The physical life of the senses was roused to energy by the very fact that the spirit watched for its every manifestation with strained attention, seeking to check and dam its course. Accordingly Paul himself gives the necessary outcome of this struggle in the accents of moral despair: "O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" He himself never doubted that the struggle between the law and his mind, far from being imaginary, was a real battle with consequences of victory and defeat. Compared with this gloomy and oppressive life, his conversion to Christ seems afterwards, in the eyes of the Apostle, the entrance into a realm of grace and freedom. "Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God," he says in Rom. v. 1. A feeling of relief came over

him as he compared the present with the past. The severity of his later judgments on all legal conceptions, his radical breach with the law, which was only there to increase sin, his uncompromising view of the "flesh," which by nature could not but lust more and more strongly against God's spirit, all show that, as a Pharisee, he took his creed seriously, that he had attempted to fulfil the law, but had found the flesh too weak.

Thus he arrived at the extreme dualistic view that the flesh is naturally evil, and that for redemption there needs a new creation of humanity after the pattern of another Adam. But these are fundamentally nothing but conclusions from Pharisaic premises; so that here also he did not work out the ideals of his youth. Seeing that his whole theology issues in the question, How does man become righteous before God? seeing that he only thinks in the categories of individual righteousness, of righteousness before the law, and righteousness before God; seeing, in short, that his theology is essentially a *doctrine of righteousness*,—we may say of his development that it proceeds throughout along the lines of his Pharisaic origins; so that he could justly say at the end of his career: "I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee."

---

4. His Personality.

Our authorities for the circumstances of Paul's career are less abundant than for his spiritual education. In dealing with them, therefore, we cannot proceed beyond the uncertainty of conjecture. Behind the legend of his youth in the second century, the Epistles afford occasional glimpses of a very different early life. If the dates in the Epistle to Philemon are to be trusted, Paul must have stayed in his Cilician home till he had reached maturity. It seems to follow, from 2 Cor. viii. 16—24, that Paul had a brother whom he afterwards converted to Christianity; while a sister of his at Jerusalem is mentioned in Acts xxiii. 16. More important is the question whether Paul, as

Luther and the reformers in general inferred from 1 Cor. vii. 8, was married at the time of his migration to Jerusalem. The passage runs as follows: "I say, therefore, to the unmarried and widows, it is good for them if they *abide* even as I."[1] According to this, the Apostle seems to count himself in the category of widowers. The sound sense of Luther felt long ago that ordinances concerning married life, such as are given by the Apostle immediately before this declaration, can only come well from one who is or has been married, and knows from experience what he is talking about.[2]

An unprejudiced perusal of 1 Cor. vi. 12—vii. 10 will confirm this judgment of Luther's. Many other passages in the Pauline Epistles display a depth of feeling and breadth of experience in family life such as only serve to deepen this impression. How clear an image he draws (1 Thess. ii. 7) of the nurse keeping the child warm, giving it food, and delighting in its every advance! How well he understands the heart of a mother who feels intuitively that her child is sanctified, though it comes to her from an unconverted husband![3] When, in Gal. iv. 19, he calls the Galatians his children of whom he travails in birth again, it is the image of a husband who knows the pangs which precede the hour of deliverance. Apt, again, is his comparison in 1 Thess. v. 4, when he likens the time to a woman who knows that she is approaching her deliverance, but will yet be surprised by the hour when she least expects it. It is not likely that an unmarried man would have compared himself to a woman in labour or a nursing mother, or would have repeated again and again that he was the begetter[4] and nurse[5] of his churches, feeding them with

[1] The ἄγαμοι are widowers, as follows from the fact that Paul begins by saying about the unmarried, that it is good for them not to touch a woman, and then proceeds to married persons, and in v. 8 comes to the widowed, *ἀγάμοις καὶ ταῖς χήραις.*

[2] Cf. Ewald, Gesch. Isr. vi. 371, and Sendschreiben d. Ap. Paul. p. 161. Among the Fathers, Paul is declared to be married, though on incorrect grounds, by Clemens Alex. Stromata, iii. 6; and Euseb. H. E. iii. 30.

[3] 1 Cor. vii. 14. [4] 1 Cor. iv. 15. [5] 1 Thess. ii. 7.

milk like babes.[1] A deep feeling for the family runs through all the Apostle's writings; and however we may understand his supposed celibacy, it is certain he was not the solitary Rabbi, as many like to think him, but speaks like any other man in the tone of one who has passed through such experiences. Moreover, only a man of experience is likely to gain that confidence of all ages and both sexes which is accorded to the Apostle throughout his churches.

The testimony of the Acts is responsible for the statement that the laborious, wearisome and ill-paid handicraft exercised by Paul was the preparation of cilicium, a coarse stuff woven of hair, and used for cloth shoes, coverlets, cloaks, and especially tents, for which reason Paul is directly named a tent-maker in the Acts. This was a trade that ranked very low, and only poor people used the Cilician stuff, or as Martial puts it:

> "Such hair as from the goats of Cinyphus
> The crookt shears of Cilician herdsmen crop."[2]

The shoes of cilicium in particular were of the coarsest in use:

> "For these not wool, but rank goat's hair was grown;
> Cinyphian gulfs where feet might lurk unknown."[3]

At the same time this industry flourished at Tarsus. From the Alps of Taurus the goatherds brought the fleeces of their goats to Tarsus in quantities. Here the hair was first spun into thread and then made up into cilicium. Thus the handicraft that Paul exercised was a mean one, but it left his brain free; and the learned in the law, who were bound to learn a craft, according to the principle of their teachers that forbade them to make the law a mattock to till the ground with,[4] might often prefer such occupations as left their thoughts unconstrained. The natural consequence was that such work was ill-paid;

[1] 1 Cor. iii. 2.

[2] Mart. vii. 95.

[3] Mart. xiv. 140, on the *udones Cilicii*. Cf. Aristot. Hist. Animal. viii. 28; Varr. Re Rust. ii. 11.

[4] Pirke Aboth, 4, 5.

whence Paul's repeated complaints that he had to labour "night and day, to be chargeable to no man."[1]

The modest circumstances in which the Tarsian scholar therefore lived were matched by his personality. Paul clearly was one of those natures, disregarded by the multitude, which nevertheless win the firm attachment of a small circle because they sympathize with every individual in it and take up every matter as their own affair. He himself speaks of how he saw himself in the consciousness of others; for the most contradictory judgments are passed upon him, scornful contempt face to face with adoring reverence. To his adversaries he gives the impression of exaggerated humility;[2] they think his bodily presence weak, and his speech contemptible.[3] They reproach him with attempting to please men and essaying flattery.[4] Sometimes he abases himself lower than the good citizens think permissible,[5] so that some consider him insincere:[6] and as he cannot always bring himself to refuse a wish, they say his modesty is deceitful and little reliance must be placed on his yea and nay.[7]

But, on the other hand, what signs of blind confidence and adoring reverence! He is contended for on every side; he promises his visit as a "a gift of grace" or as "a second benefit."[8] He is bound to give thanks in every Epistle for the abundant love they offer him; while even in the least friendly churches the latent cause of their discontent is only that he cannot visit them as often as they desire.

This apparent contradiction shows how characteristic of Paul's personality was this antithesis between outward weakness and inward abundance, recognized by himself in 2 Cor. iv. 7 and 16. As to the richness of his inward nature, there is no need of entering upon a detailed proof. He feels within him the consciousness of a spiritual pre-eminence, which bids him say

[1] 1 Thess. ii. 9. [2] 2 Cor. x. 1, 2. [3] 2 Cor. x. 10.
[4] Gal. i. 10; 1 Thess. ii. 4. [5] 2 Cor. xi. 7. [6] 2 Cor. xii. 16.
[7] 2 Cor. i. 12—18. [8] 2 Cor. i. 15.

proudly: "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds; casting down imaginations and every high thing that exalted itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ, and having a readiness to revenge all disobedience."[1]

Indeed, his Epistles will give every reader the impression of spiritual power working with the most vehement energy, pursuing an irresistible course towards its objects. To attain his ends, he deploys argument, proof, entreaty, menace and warning, adjuration and invective; he skilfully brings innumerable arguments to bear upon the mind of his reader, yet could all the while do much more, and is always conscious that he has not wholly expressed his mind.

This inner driving force, however, is not simply his own will. He is utterly devoid of egoistic and subjective interests. His motive power is something beyond him, which rules him from without. His personality is but the "vessel" that holds a divine content. In the days when he was a Pharisee, he sped to his goal of blood, urged by the will of the law contrary to his own gentle nature; so now as a Christian he expresses the constitution of his mind in the stricking phrase: "I live, yet not I."[2]

Now this submission to the thought which dominates him, finds its counterpart in the physical deficiency so contemptuously noted by his adversaries. As late as the middle of the second century, when the author of the Acts composed his history of the Apostles, it was still remembered that Paul had possessed but a small and insignificant personality; for the book tells how the citizens of Lystra beyond tha Taurus called Barnabas, his more imposing companion, Jupiter, and himself Mercury, the small and eloquent messenger of the gods.[3] At the same time his adversaries in Corinth would not so much as listen to the

[1] 2 Cor. x. 4, 5. [2] Gal. ii. 20; Acts ix. 15; Rom. ix. 21.
[3] Acts xiv. 12.

eloquence assumed by the Acts. They say: "His letters are weighty and powerful; but his bodily presence is weak and his speech contemptible."[1]

It may be inferred without hesitation that in figure Paul was insignificant and far from striking, bearing no sort of resemblance to the imposing orator whom Raphael sets on the steps of the Areopagus. In every one of his books we come across complaints of the tyranny which his body exercised over him; of illnesses by which he was visited, troubling his inner balance and checking the free exercise of his spiritual powers. "I was with you in weakness and in fear and in much trembling," he writes to the Corinthians;[2] and to the Galatians,[3] "Through infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you." He lay under an oppression which forbade him to attain the cheerful vitality of health, while it led him to write, as though expressing a general experience: "So long as we are in our earthly house, we groan, and are burdened, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven."[4] The same sense appears where he calls his body the earthen vessel in which the divine treasure is concealed, or declares that he always bears about in his body the dying of Jesus.[5]

Thus all his life long his handicraft in the close workshops was an effort and weariness to him, a burden crushing his weak body to the ground. He comes to speak of it once at least in every Epistle.[6] His feeble frame suffered less from cruel martyrdoms than from the most ordinary labour for daily bread. Yet he, who had so many wounds to tell, counts it his only glory that he had taken this burden on himself for love of the churches.[7]

If it now be asked what was the origin of this susceptibility, Paul himself speaks of an affliction which he classes as demoniac,

[1] 2 Cor. x. 10; 1 Cor. ii. 3; Gal. iv. 13. [2] 1 Cor. ii. 3.
[3] Gal. iv. 14. [4] 2 Cor. v. 2, 4. [5] 2 Cor. iv. 7, 10.
[6] 1 Thess. ii. 6, 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8; 1 Cor. ix. 2, seq.
[7] 1 Cor. ix. 15; 1 Thess. ii. 6, 9.

and whose attacks therefore deprive him of consciousness.[1] "There was given me," he says in 2 Cor. xii. 7, "a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet me. For this thing I besought the Lord thrice that it might depart from me. And he said unto me: My grace is sufficient for thee, for my strength is made perfect in weakness."[2]

Now the Apostle regards this affliction as a compensation for the extraordinary revelations vouchsafed to him from time to time. Connected together as they are by Paul, these "extraordinary revelations," with their profound upheaval of psychical life and the mysterious bodily convulsions in which a demon buffets the sufferer and drives a thorn into his flesh, are phenomena which, it is notorious, often appear together in the field of religious history. Seizures of this nature, together with a tendency to dreams, which grows more active as life goes on, occur, not only in the visionary saints of the middle ages, but also in men of mighty intellect, such as Socrates, Julius Cæsar, Mohammed and Napoleon.[3]

There were times when the superiority of mental over bodily activity in Paul culminated in visionary trances, and he could not say whether he was in the body or out of the body.[4] A slow preparation took place within him; the depths of his soul were stirred ever more profoundly, more painfully, as by a goad, till he was flung to the ground, and his inward emotion took outward shape before him as a vision or revelation.

Connected with these ecstatic states, and indeed only a lower grade of the same phenomenon, is the gift of speaking in tongues. He prided himself on possessing it to a greater extent than any other member of the Church, this inarticulate, incoherent utterance of the spirit, echoed even in the Epistles by an Abba, Father, or Maran Atha.

[1] Cf. Time of Jesus, Vol. i. p. 127 (Eng. trans.). [2] 2 Cor. xii. 7—9.

[3] Plato, Sympos. 174 D; Suet. Cæs. 45; Sprenger, Leben Moh. i. 200, seq.; Förster, Gesch. der Freiheitskriege, iii. 1017.

[4] 2 Cor. xii. 3.

It can hardly be doubted that these conditions were primarily pathological in their nature, to judge from the descriptions he himself gives in 2 Cor. xii. 3 and Gal. iv. 13, seq. Indeed, they bear a strong resemblance to the visions of Mohammed, who likewise is tortured by an angel during his revelations, so as to foam at the mouth and strike wildly around him, till a deep, death-like sleep falls upon him and renews his exhausted strength.[1]

Similar conditions are related of the mediæval visionaries. When the spiritual excitement begins to assail their sensitive bodies, their whole vitality seems to retreat to the over-irritated brain, which in turn, by its spontaneous activity, induces such irritation in the nerves of sight and hearing that visions and voices are created of themselves. At the same time, the activity of all the sensory and motor nerves is suspended, and the hypersensitized condition of the brain ends finally in an epileptic fit or catalepsy, which passes away in sleep.[2] In the case of profound and richly-endowed religious natures, such as Ansgar, Bernard and Francis, Catherine of Siena, and the anti-Trinitarian David Joris, all these circumstances repeat themselves with scarcely any variation, so that it would be difficult to deny some inner connection between the deep mental life of a religious genius and the disorder of his more delicate organs which so often ensues.

Paul's temperament is thus characterized throughout by the sensitiveness peculiar to such tender and abnormal organizations. Hence the quick rise and fall of his moods and feelings. "I breathe again, I was cast down, I was afraid, I thank God," are words which betray in turn the pause or the hurry of his pulse, the incessant ebb and flow of his heart. So it is not unnatural to find him cutting short one sentence in a burst of anger, and straightway breaking into an anacoluthon of exceeding tenderness.[3] He begins an Epistle severely and with passion,

[1] Sprenger, Leben. Moh. i. 200, seqq.

[2] Cf. Holsten, Zum Evang. Paulus u. Petrus, p. 29.

[3] Gal. iv. 12.

plunging at once into the subject on hand; but for all his harsh and abrupt beginning, his last words are, Amen, my brethren. His *I* and *we* continually betray his personal excitability. There is none of the divine peace, the even harmony, of spiritual life. He can be passionate, even unjust; but, on the other hand, shows love and self-sacrifice of which colder natures are incapable.

He is thus one of those sensitive beings who are excited and even made ill by contradiction. Further, the strength of his expressions corresponds to this ready excitability. Where we should say, "You have not despised me," he exclaims, "You have not spurned me" (lit. spat me forth);[1] where we say, "I am thought of small account," he says, "I am the filth of the world, and the off-scouring of all things;"[2] where we should say, "I set no value on it," he says, "I count it but dung."[3] Not seldom the inward turmoil finds utterance in flashes of wit and shafts of irony, which never fall beside the mark, but often wound deeply.[4]

With this degree of irritability it can be understood that there is no lack of examples to show either that Paul regrets the personal warmth of his advocacy, and is forced to acknowledge that he wishes he had adopted a different tone,[5] or that he excused vehement letters with the assurance that he wrote

[1] Gal. iv. 14. [2] 1 Cor. iv. 13. [3] Phil. iii. 8.

[4] For Paul's irony, cf. 1 Cor. iv. 3, where the Corinthians have fixed a day, and sit in judgment upon him; or (iv. 8) where he prays for a little share in the Messianic glory of his own churches; or, in Gal. v. 11, advises the friends of circumcision to be more logical. There is more good-nature in the wit of the Epistle to Philemon, or the warning of Gal. v. 15: "If ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another;" or the conclusion of the list of virtues, Gal. v. 23: "against such there is no law." A broad jest, too, occurs in his expression, "sowing to his σάρξ" (Gal. vi. 7), of the institution of circumcision. Finally, this list should include the humour with which Paul regards his handwriting at the end of the Epistle to the Galatians. We may say, then, that Paul does not lack the bitter wit of the Jew, but, like all men of earnest temper, reserves it for satire. The only exception to this is the Epistle to Philemon.

[5] Gal. iv. 20.

"out of much affliction and anguish of heart, with many tears."[1] Even after Damascus, the change from Saul to Paul is often seen in small things; yet even where he goes wrong, and fails to carry his point, his personal relations are unshaken, for people cannot do without him. He is suspicious, like all sickly organisms;[2] once, indeed, he misapplies tales that have come to his ear;[3] but love always re-asserts its supremacy.

For this portrait contains more gentle traits than harsh. Bitter and passionate as his individual judgments often sound, his general judgments are extremely temperate, such as nothing would give but true knowledge of men. This eye for goodness, even amongst many misunderstandings, which is never granted to the hard nature, evinces an abundance of love and true wisdom. It is only necessary to compare the judgment of the writer of the Apocalypse upon the Christian churches. He utterly abhors them; casts down their lights from their places; makes them naked, poor and powerless: while Paul gives thanks everywhere for all gifts of grace which are to be found abundantly among the chosen saints. The churches, in either case, cannot have been much worse or much better; indeed, they are partly the same; but Paul had a woman's tenderness in the depths of his heart. His temper is certainly choleric, but his kindly disposition is superior to his temper.[4]

Here, then, we are confronted by an individuality no less excitable than profound, no less passionate than scrupulous. Paul is a man of unique temper. While, in general, his Semitic blood and the passionate zeal of the Jew are unmistakable, still he is by no means fashioned after the usual Jewish pattern. To complete the contradiction of his type, this utter dependence of his nature on temperament must be combined with a keen-

[1] 2 Cor. ii. 4.

[2] Cf. the perfectly improbable motive ascribed to his adversaries, Phil. i. 17; Gal. ii. 13, vi. 13.

[3] 1 Cor. i. 11. See also below.

[4] Cf. Rom. ix. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 29; Gal. iv. 12—20.

ness of reasoning and intellectual energy which pursues every thought to its ultimate principle, every principle to its ultimate conclusion, and unravels the motives of others in their most secret involutions. Warm-hearted as he was, and catholic in sympathy, his hair-splitting dialectic and proofs fine-drawn to breaking-point would rival those of any Rabbi taught after the manner of his school to make mountains hang upon a horse's hair. Is salvation promised to the seed or the seeds? Did Abraham receive the promise before or after circumcision? Did Moses' countenance continue to shine under the veil, or was its glory quenched? These are all questions which profoundly exercise his hypercritical ingenuity, so that one hardly believes that the same man should be gifted with an eminently practical temper and admirable capacity to manage men and rule them.

But it is clear from his own utterances that from the moment of entering into party strife in Jerusalem he took a leading position among all his contemporaries. The Jewish Sanhedrin placed no less confidence in the spiritual weight of this physically insignificant person than afterwards the numerous congregations of the Messianic Church, which often thought their very existence dependent on his presence. For these abnormally excited temperaments are often the best adapted to bring all elements into combination, and to overcome the inertia of matter. In far higher degree than the healthy and comparatively stolid nature, they are gifted with quickness to act on first impressions, with restless vitality, with strenuous energy, with momentary demonic impetuosity against the resistance of brute matter; theirs, above all, is that persistent labour on one point which sooner or later attains its object.[1]

[1] Cf. Holsten, Zum Evang. des Paulus u. Petrus, p. 87, seq.

Second Division.

THE CONVERSION OF PAUL.

THE CONVERSION OF PAUL.

1. The Miracle of Damascus.

Shortly after the death of Jesus, if our premisses are correct,[1] the Cilician student of the law, now of ripe age, migrated to Jerusalem, where we find him actively engaged in public life, and closely connected with the Sanhedrin. Considering the zeal which then animated Paul, so that he "profited in the Jews' religion above many his equals, being more exceedingly

[1] The chronological data of Paul's life are as follows: the conversion takes place in the year 36 (2 Cor. xi. 32, Aretas' retreat from Damascus, according to Ant. xviii. 5, 3, shortly before the death of Tiberius, 16 March, 37), i.e. seventeen years (Gal. i. 18, ii. 1, before the Sabbatical year (Tisri) 53, which is being kept by the Galatians at the time the Epistle to the Galatians was composed. The Sabbatical year is established by Ant. xiv. 16, 2, and xv. 1, 2.—First visit to Jerusalem, 39, according to Gal. i. 18. Apostolic preaching, 53, according to Gal. ii. 1. Journey through Galatia and Epistle to Galatians, after the first of Tisri, therefore autumn 53, according to Gal. iv. 10. Journey through Macedonia and arrival at Corinth, before the death of the emperor Claudius (died 13 October, 54), according to Acts xviii. 2. Migration to Ephesus in 56 (Acts xviii. 11). The Ephesian period, including the travels, lasts considerably over two years (Acts xix. 10, 22, and xx. 1). At the Passover of 58 Paul is still in Ephesus (1 Cor. v. 7, xvi. 8). At the beginning of winter 58, we find him in Macedonia (cf. 2 Cor. ix. 2 with 2 Cor. xvi. 5, 6). For three months (Acts xx. 3), the Apostle stays in Corinth, and at Easter 59 (according to Acts xx. 6) he starts from Philippi for Jerusalem, where he is arrested at the Pentecost of 59. Felix leaves him in prison at Cæsarea for two years (Acts xxiv. 27), and it is not till the autumn of 61 that Festus sends him to Rome, where he arrives early in 62, and stays two full years (Acts xxviii. 30), till his death, in Nero's persecution of the Christians, in August, 64 (Tac. Ann. xv. 44). Euseb. H. E. ii. 22 and 25.

zealous of the traditions of his fathers,"[1] it must be supposed that he flung himself with all his soul into every one of the quarrels about the temple treasures, the pool of Siloam and the votive shield, which were the burning questions of the hour. In addition, the struggle with Pilate, over whom the Pharisees had already won so many victories, was not yet at an end. Then the procurator fell, through his interference with the Messianic dreams of the Samaritans.

The Pharisees might have condoned this act of interference, considering that they followed his example that same year against the disciples of Jesus. But this did not prevent them from profiting by the revolution; and Paul enjoyed the delectable year, so grateful to the hearts of the pious, when Vitellius sought by great concessions to make the inflammable material in Judæa safe amid the conflagration that raged round it in every quarter of the world. The Holy City was relieved of taxation, and the sacred robes were restored to the priests. The question of the tribute-money was settled for the Pharisees, the question of the fleet for the Sadducees; and at the Passover of the year 36 the people of Jerusalem raised the same hosannahs to the proconsul of Syria as the year before to the Prophet of Galilee.

Such were the questions on which Paul "was zealous beyond his contemporaries." The rich endowment of his own nature prevented him from realising the emptiness of the forms he contended for, because he filled them with the fervour of his own religious feeling. Thus he believed he was finding support in them, while in reality his imagination was feeding on itself.[2]

Not only does his zeal against the Christians show that the sight of the temple and the theocracy filled him with a new joy in the unique destiny of Israel, but his imagination had long been dominated by the impressions of the temple ritual, with which he is fond of comparing all that is loftiest in his own life and worship. What pleases him is "a sweet smell, a

[1] Gal. i. 14. [2] Holsten, Evang. des Paulus u. Petrus, 95.

sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God."[1] That things must be ordered in the Christian community as in the temple, that sacrilege must be punished, that every pious heart is a temple wherein dwells the spirit of God—these are to him easy and natural comparisons.[2] His Lord and Master himself he compares to the Paschal lamb slaughtered at the feast,[3] and to a sacrifice offered to God "for a sweet-smelling savour."[4] He is moved to write to his churches, as if he were a Levite: "Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple, and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar?"[5]

Following the same imagery, again, he sees in his converts sacrificial victims driven by him to the temple—creatures in which no spot or blemish may be;[6] or first-fruits brought joyfully by him as an offering to God;[7] or the lump of bread which is holy because the first-fruit of it has been dedicated.[8] And again, he, the priest, will finally be the drink-offering poured upon the sacrifice and service of their faith on the glorious day of his martyrdom.[9] It is thus plain that the events of this period were deeply graven on his heart, and in after days served him as symbols of all high and holy things that touched the deepest chords of his heart.

We can therefore easily understand how such a speech as Stephen's against the temple services, not to mention the whole blasphemous preaching of a crucified Messiah, roused the passion of his sensitive nature, and urged him against the new and dangerous sect in a fury of fanaticism. The scandal of the cross, the absence of any of the expected signs of the Messiah, which he himself points out as the special hindrance of the Jews,[10] were doubtless for him too "the stumbling-stone, the rock of offence, the snare of stumbling."[11] The far-fetched interpretation of

[1] Phil. iv. 18. [2] 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17. [3] 1 Cor. v. 7.
[4] Eph. v. 2. [5] 1 Cor. ix. 13. [6] 1 Thess. v. 23.
[7] Rom. viii. 23; 1 Cor. xvi. 15. [8] Rom. xi. 16.
[9] Phil. ii. 17. [10] 1 Cor. i. 22. [11] Rom. ix. 33, xi. 9.

Deut. xxi. 23 in the Epistle to the Galatians,[1] shows at least that Paul must have employed this expression against the Nazarenes: "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree," and was then impelled later, by the memory of his own use of it, to interpret the text conversely in favour of the doctrine of Jesus' vicarious death.[2]

His personal share in the disputations of the Hellenistic synagogues remains uncertain, for he took part in the stoning of Stephen and the persecution of the Christians less as the leader of a faction than as a deputy of the Sanhedrin. It was in this capacity that he arrested, examined, imprisoned, tortured and stoned, until, as he thought, the Church of Jerusalem was suppressed.[3] When the sectaries sought refuge in the surrounding Syro-Phœnician cities, it was resolved to attack them in those places, at all events, which were accessible to the Sanhedrin. Damascus, which possessed the largest Jewish population of all the adjacent heathen cities—some 20,000 souls at least[4]—had a Jewish ethnarch, zealous for the faith, by the favour of the victorious Aretas.[5] Here, then, at all events, it was possible to seize the fugitives, and Paul was despatched to fulfil this mission.

He bears witness himself that he became a Christian on this journey.[6] Owing to the value set upon the fact of Paul's direct call from Christ by the author of the Acts, working with the Judaists in mind, we possess three detailed accounts of this event, which, according to the narrative, took place in the immediate neighbourhood of Damascus. But the fact that each of these three accounts represents the occurrence differently, shows that the author had no documentary authority for his account, but dealt freely with oral tradition.

In the ninth chapter, where Paul is spoken of in the third

[1] Gal. iii. 13.

[2] Cf. Lipsius, Die Grundansch. d. Urgemeinde. Jahrb. des d. Prot. V. 1871, p. 89.

[3] Gal. i. 13. [4] Bell. ii. 20, 2. [5] 2 Cor. xi. 32.

[6] Gal. i. 17; 2 Cor. xi 32.

person, we learn that near Damascus Paul fell to the ground, blinded by a light, and heard a voice cry: "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" while those who journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no one.

Conversely, Paul tells in chap. xxii. that his followers saw the light indeed, but did not hear the voice. Finally, the 26th chapter gives a third version, that all fell to the ground; and this time the voice speaks to Paul in words which the former account gives to Ananias of Damascus. Hence it appears that the author of the history did not work from documents, but left the exact form of the scene on each occasion to his talent for historical composition. The story given by the Acts can, therefore, neither be accepted as an objective fact nor translated into a vision. It is better to ask what Paul himself has to say about his conversion.

In the first place, it is certain that Paul had visions of Jesus. His adversaries reproach him with boasting of his visions and revelations, and Paul admits the charge by describing the content of one such ecstasy, experienced eight years after his conversion.[1] Further, he asks expressly, in 1 Cor. ix. 1: "Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?" Now it is probable that the latter vision coincides with his conversion, because it is placed by Paul in the same series with the visions of the year 35, vouchsafed to the twelve apostles, and he regards his own vision as the last of this series, for he says: "Last of all he was seen of me as of one born out of due time; for I am the least of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the Church of God. But by the grace of God I am what I am."[2]

Clearly, then, both the violent birth of his Christianity—whether he calls it a painful birth or untimely—and his call to the apostolate, are here referred by Paul to the appearance of Christ vouchsafed to him. If we add that, in Gal. i. 12, Paul expressly says he received his gospel by a revelation of Jesus

[1] 2 Cor. xii. 1, seq. [2] 1 Cor. xv. 8—10.

Christ, no reason of any weight remains for doubting Paul's conversion by means of a vision.

Now this makes it the easier to understand why Paul should declare his whole faith in Christ to be void and vain if Christ were not risen. For he himself had been brought to his faith by the vision of the risen Christ. If Christ were not risen, then he himself would be of all men most miserable, for the occasion of his belief would then be deception.[1]

It follows that the cause of Paul's becoming a Christian was a Christophany. Further, it is possible to show what was the substance of this vision. Paul states more than once the form under which he represents Christ to himself; and it is not likely that this representation differed from the form of his vision. In other words, the substance of Paul's vision is to be obtained by realising what was the image of Christ which dwelt in Paul's mind after the vision.[2]

Here, however, we are met by the familiar figure of Daniel's Son of Man, whom Paul identifies with the heavenly man of the *first* account of the creation.[3] The representation in the Acts also approaches very closely to Paul's recollection in describing the Christophany as essentially a blaze of light, for Paul pictures the heavenly body which we shall some day assume, and *which is made like to the body of Christ*, as a body of light, shining like the stars, eternal, incorruptible, glorious, spiritual, made of the spiritual radiance which is the substance of the divine glory.

That which appeared to Paul was therefore a divine figure of light, the Son of Man in the book of Daniel, the heavenly Adam of the paradise above. Hence Paul speaks also of "the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God,"[4] which fails to shine on those only whose eyes have been blinded by the god of this world.[5] And he represents his conversion as the

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 16—19.

[2] Cf. Holsten, Evang. des Paulus u. Petrus, p. 71.

[3] 1 Thess. iv. 16, seq.; 1 Cor. xv. 22, 45—49.

[4] 2 Cor. iv. 4.

[5] 2 Cor. iv. 4.

moment in which God, "who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."[1] We, too, shall some day be changed into the image of this form of light "from glory to glory."[2]

Such, then, was the substance of the vision, of which Paul says, "He was seen of me also." But the particular form the vision took—not as he who bled upon the cross, nor he who raised himself from the grave, but as the heavenly man, a human figure coming upon the clouds—only admits of explanation on the supposition that Paul had already thought of the Messiah as the heavenly Adam and Son of Man.

It has been shown above that the conception of the Messiah coming as Daniel's Son of Man was current in the time of Jesus.[3] Thus Paul also, as a Pharisee, would have looked for this divine figure,[4] the "Man upon the clouds," as later Rabbis expressed it. Moreover, the identification of this heavenly man with the Adam of the first account of the creation, which forms the peculiar kernel of Pauline Christology, belongs originally to the Jewish schools. At least the Jewish Sibyl, in a pre-Christian passage, points to this combination;[5] and when Philo speaks of a heavenly man,[6] the archetype of sinful man, the only means of harmonizing this Platonic conception with the ideal world of the Scriptures was to identify his Platonic ideal man with the heavenly man of Daniel. Philo, indeed, did not expressly declare this identity with the Messiah; but in any case it was naturally involved in the combination of the other two ideas.

The figure of the Messiah, therefore, which appeared with such vivid clearness before the eyes of Paul, had long existed

[1] 2 Cor. iv. 6. [2] 2 Cor. iii. 18.

[3] Time of Jesus, Vol. i. p. 193, and ii. 224, seq. (Eng. trans.); Sibyll. v. 414, seq.; Friedlieb, p. xlviii.

[4] Gfrorer, Urchristenth. i. 2, 307. For further details, see below.

[5] Lib. v. 414, seq.

[6] Philo, De Opif. Mundi, 32; and Leg. Alleg. 49 M. Cf. above, Vol. i. p. 161.

in the mind of the Cilician scribe, and it only remains to ask how it came about that the familiar form of the glorified Son of Man took definite shape as the crucified Jesus whose following Paul was on the way to destroy.

Now even supporters of the traditional view relegate Christ's appearance before Damascus to the mind of the Apostle himself, only maintaining that this inward revelation of Jesus as the Messiah was effected by the direct intervention of God. But when the event is once relegated to the mind of Paul, the question inevitably follows, whether the conditions necessary for the occurrence of such an event were not pre-existent in the mind itself. For science consists precisely in being able to point out the natural elements of the great mystery involved in all life.

The question is doubly urgent with such a personality as was Paul's, a man who prided himself on his repeated visions and revelations, and was reproached with them by his adversaries.[1] Of course it was only possible for what *already existed* in his consciousness to take conscious form there as a vision; so that the whole question turns on the point whether the man who had committed so many acts of blood against the followers of the Nazarene could, in the course of an eight or ten days' journey (for this is said to be the length of the journey in question), have been so profoundly impressed by the truth of what he persecuted that the very object of his persecution appeared to him as the Messiah.

First, indeed, it might be asked whether the scenes of horror at Jerusalem were not the best preparation for this change. Amid all his zeal and passion, Paul, as we know him from his Epistles, has at bottom an almost womanly character, really unfit for such doings. Yet he was not a mere bystander when Stephen was stoned. He was the chosen witness at whose feet the executioners, according to ancient custom, laid their clothes when they stripped for their hideous task. And yet this bloodstained judge was so tender at heart! It was but in

[1] 2 Cor. xii. 1; Clem. Hom. xvii. 13, seq.

thought he was able to carry out the sanguinary severity of the law. Thus he flung himself into the suppression of the odious sect with all the restlessness of an abnormal temperament, only to find his mind invaded by a still more striking experience.

Moreover, this persecution was by no means a silent process of annihilation.[1] Paul heard not only the forced recantations of the weak, but also the scriptural reasons of those who remained firm; he beheld the glorified countenances of the martyrs and heard their appeal to Christ, the approaching judge of the world. In the discussions of the synagogue, in the examination of the prisoners and the proceedings of the Sanhedrin, he came to learn the reasons adduced by the Nazarenes for the Messiahship of Jesus.

Now these proofs from Scripture are the very arguments which Paul afterwards found so conclusive. The critical passages about the suffering servant of Jehovah, referred by the Nazarenes to Jesus, were not only adopted by Paul, but made the keystone of his doctrine of justification. Moreover, he states expressly that he received this "Scripture" from those who were Christians before him, and that his teaching was not different from theirs.[2] As to the other passages appealed to by the Christians, Paul finds them so striking that in 2 Cor. iv. 4 he declares his conviction that Satan himself must have blinded the eyes of the Jews to prevent them from seeing the image of Jesus in the Scripture; while in iii. 14 he complains that a veil is spread over their eyes and hearts as soon as the Scripture is read.

It is certain, then, that Paul convinced himself of the truth of the proof from Scripture given by those he persecuted, and it is impossible to assert that this only took place *after* his conversion to Christianity; for Paul most expressly connects his Scripture-proof, or, as he calls it, his Gospel, with the revelation at Damascus.[3] This Gospel is of no human character; he received it not by man nor from man, but by the revelation of

[1] Cf. Holsten, Zum Evang. des Paulus u. Petrus, p. 100, seq.

[2] 1 Cor. xv. 3, 11.

[3] Gal. i. 1, 12, 17.

Jesus Christ. At that hour it pleased God to reveal Jesus Christ and the Scripture concerning him to the mind of Paul. The truth of the Gospel, therefore, i.e. the fact of Jesus being the Christ promised by the Scripture, the fact that all the passages applied to him by the Nazarenes actually refer to Jesus, was revealed to him on the journey from Jerusalem to Damascus, not of man, nor by instruction, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.[1]

Granted, then, that this theoretic knowledge was an integral part of the revelation of Damascus, it is easy to fill in the intermediate steps which first led to this knowledge, and then proceed to explain the vision. As for the reasons, the truth of which now dawned upon him, he had heard them defended by saints and martyrs in Jerusalem with all the eloquence lent by martyrdom. Words of Jesus, such as he had never heard, rang in his ears during their examination or torture; among so many followers of Jesus there must even have existed written records of the sayings of the Lord. As he journeyed to Damascus to convert or extirpate the Christians in that city, what would he have been engrossed in but the passages of Scripture they had appealed to, and the words of Jesus with which they thought to prove that Jesus was the Christ? When, free at last from the whirl of party contention in Jerusalem, Paul meditated upon these words of Jesus or read them over, must they not have carried ever-increasing conviction to a religious genius such as he? Could the writer of 1 Cor. xiii. read the Sermon on the Mount without feeling thrilled to his inmost heart? Must it not have become plain to him that he who thus spoke could be no deceiver nor false prophet?

But the humiliation of the cross? This "rock of offence" and "snare of stumbling"? It cannot be denied that the Messiah crucified was a cruel contradiction to the Pharisees' expectations of the Messiah; but did not the very words of Isaiah, in which Paul's Gospel is revealed, declare that he was to be "a

[1] Gal. i. 1, 12.

man of sorrow and acquainted with grief; and we hid, as it were, our faces from him." If Isaiah liii. really treats of the Messiah, where was the humiliation? For the Scripture itself showed in the plainest words why it was necessary for the Messiah to be rejected. "The chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed."

This revelation, that the Messiah must justify the sinful world by his suffering, put an end to the crying contradiction in the doctrine of the Pharisees above mentioned. Pharisaism looked for the speedy coming of the Messiah; it was convinced that this was the final age. Yet its watchword was that none but a righteous nation would see the day of the Messiah. Here was a terrible antinomy to torment a scrupulous mind so long as it remained unsolved.[1] God could only bring the blessing of the kingdom to a righteous people; and this people is not righteous, and never will be.

This was one of those situations which tragedy used to solve by the appearance of the god: and here, too, the only solution was for God himself to make the people righteous. He makes it righteous, however, by the vicarious suffering of the Messiah, as shown in the prophecy of the servant of Jehovah. "Jehovah hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth. He was taken from prison and from judgment, and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living; for the transgression of my people was he stricken."[2] This prophetic passage, referred to by the Nazarene, was the one thing needful to resolve the contradiction on which the Pharisees made shipwreck and the schools were tormented. It swept away the obloquy of the cross. The Messiah must needs suffer according to the Scripture, and the Scripture further states the reason for his suffering.

Why, then, should Jesus not really be this suffering Messiah? He who had spoken the words which Paul heard from the

[1] Holsten, l c. p. 41.

[2] Isaiah liii. 6—8.

Nazarenes, was assuredly the greatest of all who had stretched out their hand to the diadem of the promise. One thing alone was wanting to him—attestation from without. God might kill and sacrifice His chosen one; but he must also be justified by some act of God.

In reply, the disciples of Jesus asserted that God had justified him, had raised him up from the dead. So long as Paul had held the assertion of a crucified Messiah to be blasphemy, he had not so much as considered the question whether Jesus had really risen. True that in his persecution of Stephen he found these men and women manifestly convinced that they had seen the risen Jesus; but their conviction weighed nothing against the insanity of a crucified Messiah. But what was formerly insanity in his eyes, now proved to be the veritable teaching of Scripture; so that everything was included in the single question, Did these Christians really see the risen Jesus, or was the vision a trick of their imagination.

A crucial question indeed. If they are right, he is wrong; he has fought against God and against His anointed; he has raged with fire and sword against the true object of his own aspirations. All his life long he had been zealous for the Messiah who was to come; had the Messiah now come only to be persecuted by him in his Church?

Thus everything turns upon the question, Has Jesus really risen, does he really live, was it he who was seen by the women and by the twelve and by the five hundred brethren at once? Voices of the past echo round him; new voices arise, terrible images of the last days, piercing cries of pain, looks of ecstasy,—how must all these have worked together in the inmost heart of such a man, with such days behind him, such thoughts within him, such a task before him. Nearer and nearer he comes to Damascus. He is about to renew his work of blood, to lay informations before the Sanhedrin of Damascus, to send men to the dungeon, the rack or the scaffold, and once more, sick at heart, to behold the glorified countenances of martyrs before

whom heaven opens. At this moment, "he came near Damascus, and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven; and he heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks."

Leaving Paul's personality entirely out of the question, we should have under these circumstances to say that the conditions for a visionary apparition were present here, if anywhere. The mental anguish of all these contradictions must be relieved, or the strongest vessel would burst under the strain of their disruptive forces. Now Paul was a visionary, and herein lay his salvation.

The accompanying circumstances, added to the Christophany by the Acts, are precisely the same as those which Paul mentions as attending his other visions. He falls to the ground; is deprived of the power of sight; and needs the aid of his companions to bring him in his helpless state to Damascus. His later visions are attended by the same phenomena. "It is not expedient for me to glory," he says, 2 Cor. xii. 1; "I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord. I knew a man in Christ, above fourteen years ago (whether in the body I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth), such an one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man (whether in the body or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth), how that he was caught up to paradise, and heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter."

We have here an internal, not an external event, as is clear from this personal testimony, which moreover assumes that Paul lost consciousness in these ecstasies, or else he must have known whether he was in the body or out of the body.

The Apostle, too, clearly describes, in the passage cited above, those cataleptic states which accompany visions in his own case as in many others, and are hinted at by the Acts. "And lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the mes-

senger of Satan to buffet me. For this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me. And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weakness."[1]

Thus there is a counterpoise to these heavenly revelations which prevents him from being exalted above measure. After his divine raptures he suffers from a thorn in the flesh, and finds himself in an abnormal condition, quivering as if his body were buffeted and driven to and fro by some power from without. When consciousness returned, he felt so unnerved and prostrated, that thrice he prayed God to take away this messenger of Satan; but his prayers were not granted.

Under these circumstances, the narrative of the Acts may tell of a fit, while temporary blindness may very well be associated with ecstasies so deranging to the nervous system. At all events, the Apostle, in Gal. iv. 14, describes his malady as offering a great temptation to the Galatians, so that he would not have been astonished if they, like many others,[2] had despised and rejected him; though, far from this, they would have given him their own eyes if it had been possible.[3]

Here, then, we have, in the first vision of Christ vouchsafed to him, all the pathological conditions which are recognized by Paul as attending his other visions. He tells us himself that such visions were not rarely the outcome of passionate inward processes. So, in Gal. ii. 2, he explains in detail the reasons which decided him to bring the question of circumcision to an issue in Jerusalem itself; but in the last resort it was a "revelation" in the form of an external and objective voice, bidding him go up to Jerusalem. Again, after all the arguments for and against a journey to Macedonia have been debated in Troas, a man of Macedon appears by night to Paul in a dream, and cries to him clearly, "Come over and help us."[4]

[1] 2 Cor. xii. 7. [2] 2 Cor. iv. 7, seq., x. 10, seq., xii. 9, seq.

[3] Gal. iv. 15. Cf. Rückert's Commentary, ad loc.

[4] Acts xvi. 9 perhaps stood originally in the Travel-Document.

Thus, in this case, conclusions, the premisses of which are already given, take the form of visions. But if these external struggles end in visions, how much more the terrible inward struggles which shook him so violently! Looking back, he hears himself reproached with having persecuted the innocent, insulted God and outraged the Messiah. Looking forward, he is confronted by the prospect of doing what he no longer can nor may. Looking into himself, he finds the voices of his teachers and the glorious history of Israel in open conflict with Jesus' creative word. The nearer he draws to Damascus, the greater the strain of anguish and doubt and darkness. Then a bright light shone around him—the glory of God, whereof his teachers spoke. All else vanished—Damascus, the earth, the whole world; heaven filled his view on every side, and from the opened heaven advanced the familiar figure of the Son of Man, the second Adam, the glorified figure of the Messiah: "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest; it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks." Then he falls to the ground, and others lead him to Damascus.[1]

[1] Cf. Hirzel's excellent description of the occurrence (essentially based on Ewald, Gesch. Isr. vi. 375, seq.) in Lang's Zeitstimmen of 1864, The Conversion of Paul. Renan also includes the journey through the wilderness among the factors which assist the origin of the vision, and this is not entirely to be rejected. Cf. Furrer's description of the journey from Jerusalem to Damascus, Wanderg. in Pal. 374–385. Like Renan, Sprenger falls back upon the peculiar influence of the desert as an explanation of the first vision of Mohammed, Moh. i. 216: "The pure, bracing air of the desert produces an extraordinary elation of the mind; but the surroundings are so monotonous that they offer no new images. The mind returns upon itself; past events and scenes from home arise with great vividness. Now it very often happens in nomadic life that people wander alone for weeks together, distressed by hunger and thirst; and under these circumstances the very sanest minds seldom escape without hallucinations. In Arabia it is so common for solitary wanderers to cry aloud and hear a voice speaking to them, that Arabic contains a special word, Hâtif, for this voice; while in Africa the phantom which appears to riders is called Ragol, the Companion." "Visions often lead the Bedouins astray; and many a brave man, lured on by the Jinns, has paid the penalty with his life."

2. The Glad Tidings as Jewish Theology.

Paul was a Christian on his arrival at Damascus, where he had intended to persecute the Christians. The light that made him a Christian was not as one flame kindled in him from another,—it was a lightning-flash suddenly breaking upon him. Henceforward it remains an unalterable principle of his consciousness that he had become a Christian, "not of men nor by men, but by Jesus Christ whom God raised from the dead," and that it was God himself who revealed his Son "in him."

It is the more necessary, therefore, to inquire what was his attitude to the historical origins of the new religion, and how far he, our earliest witness for the history of Christianity, took pains to acquaint himself with the Jesus of history after the latter had been revealed to his inner personality as the Messiah. The very fact that he was converted by the vision while on his journey, would lead us to expect his immediate return to the scene of Jesus' life, in order to learn exactly what manner of man he had now come to believe in. On our mode of procedure he would have been bound to learn the history of Jesus from the lips of his disciples, and not to have rested until he had discovered the minutest detail of his life in all its bearings. Instead of this, he adopted the opposite course. "I certify you," he says,[1] "that I neither received my gospel of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. . . . . But when it pleased God to reveal his Son in me, immediately *I conferred not with flesh and blood, neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me,* but I went into Arabia and returned again unto Damascus."

The attitude towards historical fact thus presented is somewhat startling, and might lead us to suggest that it would have been better if the Apostle had consulted with flesh and blood, and had inquired of those who were in a position to know the

[1] Gal. i. 16.

true character of the Jesus who had been revealed to him. The opposite course arouses our suspicion; and the question how far Paul actually possessed a fairly accurate knowledge of Jesus' life, becomes more significant in proportion as the primitive Church based its conceptions of Jesus upon these very expressions of Paul's. For it is easy to show that the theologians of the Œcumenical Councils followed Paul and John rather than the Synoptics in their attitude towards Jesus. The greater, then, is the importance of the question: Had Paul, who never saw him, any adequate information about Jesus?

The first thing that makes it difficult to decide is the fact that we know so little of the period following the vision of Damascus, that is to say, of the special time of the Apostle's training. It is fairly certain that Paul, who baptized others,[1] had himself been baptized, and probably some instruction upon the life and teaching of Jesus preceded this baptism. But the account of this instruction in the Acts is interwoven with so much symbolism that it cannot possibly be regarded as history pure and simple.

The means, too, by which it is effected are easily seen to be imaginary. Paul's instructor appears as a man faithful to the law, by name Ananias; but according to the representation ascribed to the Judæo-Christians, Paul's teachers were one and all faithful to the law.[2] He is said to live in the street "called straight;" but this particular street is the far-famed boulevard of Damascus, and probably the only street known to the author, or indeed to the average man, but hardly one to harbour Jews or poor fugitives.[3]

On the other hand, Paul's own testimony confirms one point in the account of the Acts. The conversion of the learned emissary of the Sanhedrin provoked such bitterness in the Jewish quarter of Damascus[4] that his stay was cut short, and

[1] 1 Cor. i. 16. [2] Acts xxii. 12, xxii. 3, ix. 26.

[3] Petermann, Reisen im Or. i. 96; Renan, Ap. 184.

[4] 2 Cor. xi. 32.

he had hardly entered into relations with the Christians before they were broken off. The man who had come to extirpate the followers of the false prophet, and now appeared as one of them, could not but arouse a storm of ill-feeling. Aretas, the Arabian king, had granted the Jews of Damascus an ethnarch of their own who undoubtedly possessed extensive jurisdiction. This newly-created ethnarch ordered the arrest of the apostate from the Sanhedrin. Paul concealed himself, and the gates of the city and the Jewish quarter were watched to prevent his escape. On his own interpretation of the law, stoning would have been the due penalty for his crime, unless the people of Damascus preferred to send back in chains to the Sanhedrin the wonderful emissary it had despatched to persecute the Christians.

However, the religious conflict of the Jews was to end this time without blood. Paul's new co-religionists knew of a friendly house, from which a window opened through the city wall. Through this he was let down in a basket, and escaped to Hauran.

This night descent in the basket down the lofty wall, while the Jewish spies perhaps were waiting below to arrest him and drag him off to be stoned, remained always with him as a dreadful memory. More than twenty years after, he described it more graphically than any other of his sufferings related; more graphically even than the stoning he once endured, and the shipwreck when he was tossed about upon the sea for a day and a night. From Damascus Paul did not come without mishap to Jerusalem, as is related by the Acts, but departed into Arabia.[1]

There is no reason to take this as the distant Arabia Felix, the land of spice and balsam, whose northern boundary runs from the extremity of the Arabian to the Persian Gulf. Arabia Petræa would be more likely, the kingdom of Aretas, whose brilliant capital in Mount Seir stands on the caravan route from Damascus to Aila. At this point begins the famous pilgrims' way to Horeb and Sinai, leading to the sacred mountain through

[1] Gal. i. 17.

the peninsula of Sinai, with its scanty valleys of palms hidden among the rocky deserts.

Now since Paul, in Gal. iv. 21, displays a certain directness of touch in comparing the sterile Sinai with the sterility of the law, and mentions the local Arabic name of the mountain, it is very probable that during the years he spent in Arabia he joined the crowd of pilgrims who yearly flocked along the road to the holy mountains of Horeb and Sinai through the bleak and rocky valleys of the peninsula studded with ancient inscriptions.

But in Gal. i. 17, we must understand by "Arabia," as always in Paul, the Roman district of this name, Hauran or Auranitis. The most important city on the road from Damascus through Arabia was the rock fortress of Pella,[1] and this, at the outbreak of the war, had a Christian church in which the Christians of Jerusalem sought refuge.[2] But it is impossible even to conjecture whether this "place prepared of God to shelter the woman," as the Apocalypse calls Pella (xii. 6), contained Christians at this time, or whether it was Paul's place of refuge. Apart from this, it is very probable that he kept to the towns along the road from Damascus, because he came back there after his sojourn in Arabia.

Since the Apostle had already spoken to the Jews in Damascus, it is safe to assume that he did not refrain from proclaiming the appearance of the Messiah in the synagogues of Arabia. But he was not now travelling with the design of spreading Christianity; he was seeking rest and retirement, of which he must have stood in need after so violent a revolution. This, indeed, is involved in the words of Gal. i. 16: "I conferred not with flesh and blood, but went into Arabia." So, too, the Baptist had withdrawn into the wilderness when the spirit seized upon him; so, too, Jesus gathers up all his forces in the wilderness for the preaching of the kingdom; so Josephus flees to the

[1] Plin. Hist. Nat. v. 16; Euseb. Onom. Decap. Pompey marches from Damascus to Pella, Ant. xiv. 3, 4; Bell. i. 6, 5.

[2] Euseb. H. E. iii. 5, 3.

Dead Sea when the better voices within him gained the upper hand; so, too, from this time on, a whole generation begin the new life with retreat from the world. For the rest, the movements of the Tarsian are all the more difficult to follow, because the war between Aretas on the one side, and Antipas and Vitellius on the other, threw this particular district into great confusion. We hear that Paul returned thence to Damascus, to leave it for Jerusalem in the year 39, three years after his conversion. It is not known whether Paul remained in Arabia during these three years, and only returned to Damascus for a short time, or if he returned to Damascus immediately the re-conquest of Damascus by the Romans made it possible, so as to make the three years mentioned in Gal. i. 18 refer as a whole to Damascus. At all events, a considerable time had passed before Paul thought, or perhaps even dared think, of returning to Jerusalem.

The object of his journey to Jerusalem was, as he himself says in Gal. i. 18, to become acquainted with Peter. Under existing circumstances, it could not be advisable for him to enter into relations with the whole church of Christians, for he had good cause to shroud his visit to the fanatical city in the deepest obscurity. He had the less difficulty in concealment because, in the year 39, Caligula's attempt on the temple had roused the whole population. No one troubled about the Christians when the statue destined for the desecration of the temple was on its way; and the news of its arrival drew multitudes to successive places on the route, where they stayed for weeks at a time and raised a great national lamentation, first at Ptolemais, next at Tiberias, and then at Antipatris. So Paul remained undiscovered.

According to the Acts, he had great difficulty in approaching the church of Jerusalem, until Joses of Cyprus, surnamed Barnabas, made him acquainted with the twelve. On the other hand, Paul himself states that he only saw Peter: "Other of the disciples saw I none, save James, the Lord's brother; before

God, I lie not."[1] Now the fact of Paul's seeking out any representative of Jesus' apostles and family must be taken as a sign of his earnest desire to obtain more certain knowledge of the historical origins of his belief.

Certain as it is that Paul neither knew Jesus nor was familiar with his disciples,—certain, too, that he was not intimately concerned with the historical origins of Christianity, and scarcely ever employs them in his Epistles,—it does not follow that he was unacquainted with them. Two periods of residence in Damascus, and the visit to Jerusalem, with the possession, may be, of a written gospel, sufficed to give him an adequate general knowledge of the life of Jesus. As to his putting aside the historical part in his Epistles, deducing Jesus' Messiahship from the Old Testament rather than from the life of Jesus, and caring less for the points of Jesus' life than the significance of his death—these are due, not to his imperfect knowledge, but to his speculative cast of mind, which thought in religious postulates, not in actualities.

But on occasion he could go into historical details, as is shown by his own expression to the Galatians, that he had set forth Jesus Christ crucified so clearly before their eyes that he never believed he need fear their turning to another gospel.[2]

Further, his knowledge embraces the whole life of Jesus. He mentions the Davidic origin,[3] and knows of the baptism, which he practises upon others and converts into symbolism and allegory in his speeches.[4] He knows the preaching of the kingdom, the sending forth of the apostles, their equipment with power over spirits,[5] and is so used to calling them "the Twelve," as in the time of Jesus, that he continued to use the term when it was no longer applicable;[6] while Jesus' life of poverty,[7] with its guiding spirit of mildness and compassion, its self-forgetful, humble,

[1] Gal. i. 19. [2] Gal. iii. 1. [3] Rom. i. 3, ix. 5.
[4] Col. ii. 11; 1 Cor. x. 2; Rom. vi. 3, 4; 1 Cor. xii. 13; Gal. iii. 27.
[5] 2 Cor. xii. 12; 1 Cor. xii. 10, xxviii. 29; Gal. iii. 5.
[6] 1 Cor. xv. 5. [7] Phil. ii. 4—8.

ministering love, essential factors of the "life of Jesus," is clearly present in the mind of the Apostle.[1]

So, too, he has better knowledge of the history of the Passion than the Evangelists themselves. At least his account of the last supper, "on the same night in which he was betrayed," gives a correct solution of all the discrepancies in the Synoptics;[2] he is aware that it was the rulers at the time, not the people, who desired the death of Jesus;[3] while the treachery of Judas,[4] the despiteful treatment of Jesus,[5] his humiliation on the cross,[6] the writing of the proconsul nailed upon it,[7] are one and all so vividly before his mind that he could pourtray them to the eyes of others.

Clearest and most definite of all, however, is his list of the appearances after the resurrection. We learn through him of two appearances—one to James, one to the five hundred brethren —which have disappeared from the canonical Gospels. This, then, Paul certainly learned "from flesh and blood;" this is a point on which he necessarily "received instruction of men," as indeed he expressly says in passing: "I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received."[8] Again, his knowledge of the sayings of the Lord is as minute as that of the history of Jesus. He obviously took pains to learn the utterances of Jesus on all important questions. When he has not this to go upon, he says so openly.[9]

As to proofs, of course he follows his Rabbinical usage in applying sayings of the Old Testament alone, only citing words of the Lord incidentally. But indirect references to the sayings and parables of Jesus are proportionately numerous.[10] Some-

[1] 2 Cor. v. 14, seq.; Gal. ii. 20; Phil. i. 8.
[2] 1 Cor. xi. 23.
[3] 1 Cor. ii. 8.
[4] 1 Cor. xi. 23.
[5] Rom. xv. 3.
[6] 2 Cor. xiii. 4.
[7] Col. ii. 14.
[8] 1 Cor. xv. 3.
[9] 1 Cor. vii. 25.

[10] A real quotation occurs in 1 Cor. ix. 14 and 1 Thess. ii. 6, based upon Luke x. 7. So 1 Cor. vii. 10, referring to Matt. v. 32. Indirect allusions are more frequent; Rom. xiv. 4, ii. 1, is a reminiscence of the uncharitable

times, indeed, he seems to refer to words of Jesus in all probability lost to us.[1]

If, notwithstanding, the historical influence of the life of Jesus has but a subordinate meaning for Paul, the vision under discussion can only rest upon the superiority of the spontaneous mental activity in him over the receptive. As in his vivid spontaneity he never quotes without adding something of his own, so throughout his life he preached a Son of God who had been revealed "in him."

A man with such a development of spiritual activity is, as a rule, seldom of an objective cast of mind. He merges himself in the message he preaches. If it is hard to tell whether Plato's Socrates is more Socrates or Plato, it is still harder to decide how far Paul's preaching of Jesus is of revelation or tradition. Still the vision has another basis: as Jewish theology, it is connected with the entire character of his gospel.

As to the mode in which Paul arrived at the assurance that Jesus was the Messiah, it must be premised that influences were supplied in the Pharisaic scheme of the world which made this development of thought possible and aided it. A conversion

judge in Matt. vii. 1. Matt. xvii. 26, 27, floats before the explanation of Christian liberty and loving-kindness in 1 Cor. vi. 12. The blind guides of Rom. ii. 19 come from Matt. xv. 14, and the description of the kingdom in Rom. xiv. 17 from Matt. v. 3. "Eat what is set before you," 1 Cor. x. 27, is also the watchword of Luke x. 8 and Matt. xv. 11. Faith that removes mountains, of 1 Cor. xiii. 2, is from Matt. xvii. 20. The Yea, yea, of 2 Cor. i. 17, from Matt. v. 37. "Cursed, we bless," from Matt. v. 41, which is thus attested as genuine. But the eschatological discussions of the Apostle are the most deeply imbued with references to Jesus' eschatological discourses. Thus Paul compares himself to the giver of the bride on the day of the Parusia, 2 Cor. xi. 2, seq., recalling the image of the bridegroom, Matt. ix. 15, xxv. 1—12. Similarly, the gathering in of the faithful, 1 Thess. iv. 14, seq., comes from Matt. xxiv. 30. The trump, 1 Thess. iv. 16, from Matt. xxiv. 31. The clouds of the Parusia, 1 Thess. iv. 17, from Matt. xxiv. 30. The thief in the night, 1 Thess. v. 2, from Matt. xxiv. 36; not to mention many other allusions, e.g. the parables of the sower, the vineyard, the plough, &c.

[1] So 1 Thess. iv. 15.

such as his, without external instruction, without prolonged moral influences, could only be based on a dialectical process whereby Paul recognized in the works of Jesus the fulfilment of the postulates of his own thought, no matter whether he reached this knowledge as a logical abstraction of his own or as an outward manifestation by means of a vision.

Now under these circumstances there existed no occasion for Paul to break with his earlier scheme of things, the principles of which had, though unconsciously, led him to his belief in Jesus, and therefore were not in irreconcilable opposition to the gospel. We have seen already that in his Pharisaic speculations on the mode in which man could be justified before God, Paul simply took up the paradox of the crucified Messiah to solve the antinomy established by the Pharisaic doctrine of justification. Indeed, the whole paraphernalia of Pharisaic thought remained with him so entirely, that out of all the history of salvation the only points of use to his speculations are the death and resurrection of Jesus. As for the rich actuality of the life of Jesus, spread out before us in the Synoptics, Paul has no use for such parts as are either rhetorical or didactic. He knows the life, but erects nothing upon it. The death and resurrection are the sole events from which his entire theology is developed. To fathom their significance is the sum of his theology.

If the crucified Jesus was the Messiah spoken of by all the prophets, it was obvious that the secret of the divine intention must be involved in the paradox of the fate of the chosen envoy. Here, then, the true secret of human salvation was to be sought; not in the teaching of Jesus, but in his death.

We have, therefore, in Paul's theology, not an expansion of Jesus' thought, but an immanent development of the Jewish consciousness, called into being by the new fact of the crucified Messiah. If Paul had settled down to the task of systematically expounding the teaching of Jesus, he must have started from Jesus' loftiest conception—the idea of the kingdom of God. He would have had to describe the attributes of the kingdom from

the sayings of Jesus; to develop the conditions for entrance into it and exclusion from it; to define Jesus as sovereign of the kingdom, and a representative, not of its future coming, but of its actual presence. Again, he would have been bound to quote the words of Jesus as often as he quotes the Old Testament, and to speak of the life of Jesus as he speaks of Abraham and of Moses and the law.

Now Paul does not make the smallest approach to this course. The very attributes applied by him to the person of Jesus are not taken from expressions of Jesus. Jesus nowhere spoke of himself as the divine man, the second Adam, or the image of God, in which the new creation of humanity is perfected, nor even that in the kingdom of God we shall be made like to his heavenly body.

All these conceptions originate in Paul's theory of man, not in the teaching of Jesus. Paul, consequently, did not give up his Jewish theology when he became a Christian, considering that he continues to call himself a Pharisee at the close of his life.[1] A new movement entered his Jewish conceptions only so far as he was compelled to face the question, How is the Jewish conception of the world, true in itself and universally admitted, affected by the fact that the Messiah died and rose again? The fundamental postulate which summed up all religion for the Jews, namely, that man must be justified before God, remained unshaken in Paul, no less than the Pharisees' inference that God would not bring salvation to men until they satisfy this postulate. But both these axioms are brought into relation with the crucified Messiah, and give rise to new deductions. In short, before his conversion, Paul's answer to the question, How shall man be justified before God? would have been that of his teachers, "By fulfilling the law;" now it was, "By the vicarious sacrifice of the Messiah."

Thus we have not to deal with a development of the teaching of Jesus, but with a doctrine about Jesus. For Paul, Jesus was

[1] 2 Cor. xi. 22; Phil. iii. 5; Acts xxiii. 6.

not a teacher, but a mediator. He did not teach something; he did something. In Paul's eyes, therefore, Christianity does not consist in a theory, but in a faith and a condition of life produced by faith. While thus only giving a new answer to an old question, Paul further develops the rich significance of this answer, not in relation to individual words of Jesus, but in constant antithesis to the answers given by the Jewish school. So the chief motives of Pauline theology lie in the antithesis between justification by the law and justification of grace by faith; and this antithesis bounds the teaching of the Apostle from beginning to end.

With regard to the notion of justification, Paul still agrees with his teachers in holding it to exhaust everything demanded of man by God. Justification is the state in which all moral and religious demands made by God are realized; it is the adequate relation of man to God aimed at by every religion. The Pauline Epistles, in short, turn on the settlement of the question as to what justification can stand before God, what God himself does by grace, what man himself may do by keeping the law; the ideas of justification from God or from faith, of personal justification or justification by the law; but such were the questions Paul dealt with in the days when he was a Pharisee.[1]

Now if in answer to the question, "How is man justified before God?" Paul could say, "By fulfilment of the law," it follows at once that by "the law" he does not merely understand the ritual ordinances of Judaism, circumcision, the customary ablutions, purifications, abstentions, and acts of worship. In his eyes, the law as a whole comprises all religious and ethical duties, not excepting purity of heart, brotherly love, and morality in general. For him the universal moral law and the Mosaic law are identical; he only speaks specifically of the Mosaic law where we speak of the moral law, because he knows no higher expression of the moral law.

[1] Cf. Time of Jesus, Vol. i. pp. 145 and 168 (Eng. trans.).

Now his inclusion of the universal postulates of morality in the word "law," without any exclusive reference to the ritual law of Judaism, is shown by the introduction to the Epistle to the Romans, where he ascribes a "law" to the heathens also, and declares that they too had entered upon the path of personal and legal righteousness, but had been as unsuccessful in attaining their object as Judaism.

Thus law and faith are opposed to one another as morality and religion, and the question whether one path or the other leads to righteousness is consequently of universal significance. Yet Paul does not deny that fulfilment of the law, that is to say, perfect morality and ecclesiasticism, ensure righteousness before God; though he does deny that any individual can enter into this state by his own power: he denies that mere human nature is sufficient of itself to fulfil the law, or, as we should say, to practise true morality.

With this perception that human nature in itself is incapable of living after the divine ordinances, Paul takes his stand within the dualistic scheme of the world, introduced by the Hellenists into Judaism. Human nature belongs to a finite world, and is subject to the laws of this finite existence. The law is divine, spiritual, good; and for this very reason it is not given to finite humanity to fulfil the law. Now this brings us to the problem of the time, at which the thought of the Gentile world was labouring even more than the Jewish schools.

What, in fine, had become the one question of contemporary philosophy was this: How has human nature the power to attain the *vita beata?* How can it, being imperfect, material, evil, raise itself above the bonds of finitude which encircle it? Greek thought had been wrecked on this problem; we have now to see whether this new Jewish school can find a solution leading to unity in the conception of the world. Here, as a matter of fact, is the link. But Platonism was to be indistinguishably mingled with Hebrew conceptions before it succeeded in resolving the antinomy it had itself engendered.

3. The Speculative Premisses of Pauline Theology.

The contemporaries of the Apostle conceived of two worlds standing in antagonism to each other. On the one side, the heavenly world, the source of all power and life, the dwelling-place of the types of all being; on the other, the material world, which would be void of shape or being, did not the shadows of the ideas lend it form and life. But this material world is by its nature the contrary of the spiritual. It is inanimate, evil, sinful; at once the basis of opposition to the idea and cause of the corruptibility of all earthly forms. This originally Platonic notion had been for generations the field within which the thought of the civilized world ranged.

Judaism, too, with its transcendental idea of God and its spiritual religion, found no difficulty in fitting its religious conceptions into this antithesis. The Biblical scheme of things, at all events in the later books, divides the universe into two spheres, earth and heaven. Heaven is the world of spirits; the substance of which it consists is the substance of light or glory (δόξα). The forms and shapes of the earthly world are, on the contrary, bound up in earthly matter. It is unnecessary to discuss here how far this particular view was a development from the Hebrew scheme of the world, or how far it was based upon subsequent knowledge of the Parsees' dualistic religion. At all events, there was no difficulty in harmonizing it with the Platonic dualism.

This Platonic dualism, then, is a pre-supposition of Pauline theology.[1] Paul, it need hardly be said, never discussed the question whether matter existed from everlasting, and how

[1] What we call *monism* is either materialism, idealism, or the view that the world developed itself by evolution from God. By *dualism* we mean the recognition of a second principle, whose operation cannot be regarded as willed by God. In this sense Paul is a dualist, although he knows no *hyle*, and his predestinarianism derives everything in the last resort from God.

spirit and matter came together as they are, seeing that his theology confines itself to the justification of man. Here, however, the dualistic tendencies of his thought are clearly visible. The First Epistle to the Corinthians[1] infers from Gen. ii. 7 that man is formed of earth and animated with a breath of life, so that by nature he is after the flesh (σάρξ), i.e. of matter taken from the earth, and only differentiated from the earth by the breath of life (ψυχή). The fundamental element of human nature is of the earth earthy: only the vital force breathed into it by God differentiates it from inanimate matter.[2] By its nature it is finite, or, as the Apostle expresses it, corruptible.[3] It is unclean, like all matter that passes from generation to corruption.[4]

The antithesis to the flesh consists of the other universal principle, the spirit (πνεῦμα), a conception, be it noted, which does not altogether tally with our conception of spirit. For modern thought, in opposing spirit to flesh, begins by denying materiality to spirit. The attitude of ancient thought on this point was different. Force was inconceivable without some material substratum, and spirit was matter also, but infinitely fine, brilliant matter, mobile and motor, the penetrating fluid which vitalizes inert matter.[5] Only thus could Platonism conceive of notions or ideas as *existences*, and Plato speak of the fields of truth, where the souls exercise their steeds.

Now the heaven of the Apocalypse, with its deity shining like a ruby,[6] its white-robed souls and visible world of spirits, no more conceives of the spirit from our point of view than does the Platonic world of ideas. Thus Paul also conceives of the Pneuma as a form of matter, although the antithesis of the flesh. Otherwise he could not speak, as he does, of spiritual bodies springing from a seed.[7]

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 45, seq.

[2] For what follows, see especially Holsten, Die Bedeutung des Wortes, σάρξ, l. c., and Pfleiderer, Paulismus, p. 47, seq.

[3] 1 Cor. xv. 50, 53, 55; 2 Cor. iv. 11, v. 4. [4] 1 Cor. xv. 50, 42.

[5] Wisdom, viii. 1. [6] Rev. iv. 3. [7] 1 Cor. xv. 44.

Now the specific physical basis of the notion of spirit is, as the etymology signifies, that of "blowing." The spirit blows whither it listeth. So far the spirit is the motive principle of the universe. The spirit works, creates and drives those that are born of it; it is the breath of the world, and without it there would be nothing but the unalterable repose of death and endless desolation.[1]

Now, in the first place, the spirit is a bright, shining, warming substance. The being of God is "glory;" his likeness in Christ is to be thought of as a shining figure, and those who receive the spiritual body are changed from glory to glory.[2] When, therefore, the spirit comes to men, a brighter light is set in their hearts.[3] Moreover, the spiritual bodies assumed by the glorified shine in different glory. "For," it is said in 1 Cor. xv. 41, "there is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differeth from another in glory. So also is the resurrection of the dead."

When this spirit is called holy, the Holy Ghost, this actual holiness, is ascribed to it in the general sense in which things are holy. That is holy which is pure in itself, unspotted by anything else, and therefore acceptable to God. The spirit is holy, because it did not originate by generation, and is not subject to the unclean processes of ferment, corruption and death, like all finite being. While material things defile under certain circumstances, if not always, and make an object impure and displeasing to God, the spirit purifies, for it is not subject to these defiling conditions, as being of one substance with God, and therefore acceptable to God. Accordingly, on this side also the spirit stands in substantial antithesis to the physical side of humanity.[4] Finally, the spirit is everlasting and invisible;

[1] Gal. v. 18; Rom. viii. 13.

[2] 2 Cor. iii. 18, iv. 6; 1 Cor. xv. 41, xiv. 25; Rom. xii. 11.

[3] 2 Cor. iv. 4—6; Rom. v. 5, xii. 11; 1 Cor. xiv. 25.

[4] ἅγιος stands in this sense especially in 1 Cor. vii. 14; cf. Rom. vi. 19.

everlasting, because not inanimate matter, but life; invisible, because light, and therefore transparent.[1]

Existence, then, in the mind of the Apostle, is divided into an impure world of sense and the spiritual, holy world, just as in Plato the sensible world is opposed to the ideal. On the one side there is only impurity, death, darkness, sin; on the other, light, clearness, felicity, purity and holiness. Now it is between these two kingdoms that man is placed. By nature he belongs to the lower; by God's grace he can attain to the higher. By our "outer man"[2] we are flesh, animated and intelligent matter. It was the "soul" that converted the clod of earth into a living body: and the Jew conceived of this soul as dwelling in the blood and passing away with the blood. It comes into being with the body, and departs with the body, as the principle of sense and motion in man; it is not everlasting and immortal, like the heavenly body.

Yet, following a distinction common in the schools of Plato and Philo, Paul distinguishes an "inward man" from the outer and phenomenal man.[3] This inner man is also called the πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπου, the spirit of man, who has thought and judgment by means of the νοῦς and self-consciousness in the καρδία. These attributes of holiness and purity belonging to the divine spirit, do not as yet pertain to the human spirit. The πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπου is only the vessel capable of receiving the πνεῦμα θεοῦ,[4] as well, indeed, as the influences of evil spirits.

[1] Rom. i. 20.

[2] Cf. Lüdemann, Anthropol. des Ap. Paulus, Kiel, 1872, p. 47.

[3] Cf. Fritzsche on Rom. vii. 22.

[4] The sinful man, devoid of the divine spirit, also possesses a πνεῦμα, as appears from 1 Cor. v. 5, where the incestuous is to be punished ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ. Even the incestuous, then, have a soul, which is not immortal in itself, yet may possibly be saved. So in 1 Cor. ii. 11, the spirit of man "which is in him" is distinguished from the Holy Ghost. 2 Cor. ii. 12 speaks of the need of rest in the Apostle's spirit, and 2 Cor. vii. 13 (cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 18) of the capacity of the spirit to be refreshed. Therefore man too has a spirit, which in itself belongs neither to the holy, divine world, nor to the earthly, sinful world, but may be determined to either side. Cf. Lüdemann, l. c. 48.

For besides the holy, spiritual world of light, there are various πνεύματα,[1] though Paul has never stated exactly his idea of these demons.

Now considering that this human spirit, the "inward man" (ἔσω ἄνθρωπος), is intrinsically a mere formal means, our whole being is under the dominion of the "flesh," so that it is possible to speak even of a νοῦς τῆς σαρκός (Col. ii. 18) and ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν (Rom. i. 24). Without God's intercession, our life can only move in those sinful processes which are inseparably bound up with the unholy nature of earthly matter. "I know," says the Apostle, in Rom. vii. 18, "that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing." "Sin dwelleth in my flesh." "As long as we are in the flesh, the desires are strong within us," for the flesh has a tendency towards itself; which tendency is so integral to it, that Paul calls it the law of the flesh, to which it is naturally subject. Under this law we are once more "sold" in bondage to the flesh. We are its debtors, bound to live after the will of the creditor.[2] Desire is not a voluntary condition of man, but a law to which he is enslaved, so that even if his conscience wills otherwise in accordance with external laws, he cannot but do what he would not.[3]

Again, the object of this desire of the flesh is the fleshly and sensual opposed to the divine and spiritual. The flesh lusts against the spirit,[4] and thus the flesh is the principle of evil and sin, because it strives against God and is self-regarding. In consequence of this selfish tendency, it is the principle of pride and sensual sin. In consequence of its incapacity to grasp the spiritual, it is the principle of all deadly error, idolatry, witchcraft, and every form of delusion.[5]

We have thus in the world of sense two principles acting in opposition. The flesh will produce nothing but adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred,

[1] 2 Cor. xii. 18, xi. 4.
[2] Rom. viii. 12.
[3] Rom. vii. 15—25, viii. 6.
[4] Gal. v. 17.
[5] Gal. v. 19—21.

variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like. If, on the contrary, a portion of the spiritual life is introduced into a human heart, it produces a life acceptable to God: love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance.[1]

Thus Paul professes an ethical dualism. It is a pertinent question whether behind this there does not lie a metaphysical dualism; that is to say, whether spirit and matter, God and the world, are not opposed to one another in his view as realms of equal power. Radical disciples, like Marcion, expanded his thought on these lines, and based the dualism of human nature upon a metaphysical dualism.

All Gnostic systems also attached themselves by preference to the Pauline terminology, while radical opponents made him responsible as Simon Magus for the whole of Gnosticism. Yet this was not Paul's view. Apart from the fact that he did not touch upon the question of the relation of God to matter, the Jewish conception of God is so strongly established in him at every point that no room is left beside God for independent matter or independent evil. The true basis of his dualism in human nature is rather to be found in the deep sense of his own sinfulness and bondage, whereby he sees in himself nothing but sin, the flesh and impurity, ascribing all better impulses to God.

Given this origin to his dualistic theory of human nature, it may further be conjectured that the theory was only worked out after his conversion. Full consciousness of sin was needful before Paul could reach so dark a view of the fleshly man, which he did not hold in the days of his Pharisaism, when he still fancied it possible for man to fulfil the law. It is more likely that his new conception of the significance of the law has for its basis precisely this new view of his upon the nature of man.

[1] Gal. v. 19, seq.

4. New Conception of The Law.

Few men have had so deep a sense of their unworthiness before God as Paul; none before his time expressed this sense in so radical a theory. Man is flesh, and the lust of this flesh within him stands opposed to the spiritual world. The flesh, therefore, is by nature sinful. Man need not begin by introducing his own volition into the lusts of his nature in order to give it a direction against God. His nature of itself stands in opposition to the ethical requirements of the spiritual world.

As man is flesh, then, he is by nature evil. The flesh cannot help lusting against the spirit;[1] sin dwells in man, in his flesh, and is the law of his members.[2] Sin, then, being a natural quality of the flesh, not acquired by a free act on the part of man, it follows, further, that for Paul the notion of sin involves neither consciousness nor capability of having sin imputed. For him, sin and conscious transgression are very different. Sin is the factitious condition of our nature, which is opposed to God's holiness and purity as much as other "abominations" which provoke the wrath of Jehovah and defile that which is pure.

The conception of sin, therefore, which Paul employs is the Jewish conception. To the Jew, sin is not something subjective,[3]

[1] Rom. viii. 7; Gal. v. 17; Rom. vii.

[2] This derivation of *ἁμαρτία* from the *σάρξ* is not opposed by the fact that Rom. v. 12, seq., makes sin begin with the fall of the first man. For Paul thinks of the first man as sinful *by his nature*, and not by his own volition, as follows from the contrast of the heavenly Adam in 1 Cor. xv. 45, where it is regarded as self-intelligible that flesh and blood cannot inherit incorruptibility, and that everything made after the pattern of the first Adam is subject to *φθορά*. So, too, it is said expressly that the first Adam was originally no more than a living "soul," and had not acquired the spiritual of his period. He therefore belonged to sin and corruption from the very first, for he is sinful *quâ* "flesh." Cf. Holsten, p. 407, and Lüdemann, Anthropologie des Paulus: "After the creation of man, after the union of the *νοῦς* with the *πνοὴ Ζωῆς*, the *σάρξ* was immediately present with the *ψυχή*. The immediate consequence was that *ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κοσμόν*."

[3] Cf. the use of *ἁμαρτία* in the LXX.

but a state contrary to God, not involving subjective volition any more than Levitical uncleanness, for even purely physical and objective conditions can provoke God's anger. In this sense the sensible, material, physical basis of our existence is unholy and sinful: subjective sin, or transgression, on the other hand, only began with the revelation of the law.

As, however, sinful tendencies are natural to the flesh, the "inward man," however strongly determined by the law, is still powerless against the flesh. Man now fulfils the impulse of the flesh only *against* his better knowledge and will, and thus sin becomes transgression. Now, too, it first becomes conscious, and guilt which may be imputed. And yet man was incapable of doing otherwise. Sin is a necessity of human nature precisely because it is physical and a property of the flesh. Man can no more free himself from sin than from his physical frame. From the revelation of the divine will, therefore, there rises in the "inward man" the struggle so movingly depicted by the Apostle: "We know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do, I know not. For not what I would, that do I practise; but what I hate, that I do. But if what I would not, that I do, I consent unto the law that it is good. So now it is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me. For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing; for to will is present with me, but to do that which is good is not. For the good which I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I practise."[1]

Thus in spite of the better insight effected by the law, nothing is brought about but the will of the flesh. Man, consequently, is not free; he is determined, and from the consciousness of this physical captivity rises the cry: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death? I delight in the law of God after the inward man; but I see a different law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity under the law of sin which is in my

[1] Rom. vii. 14, seq.

members." Man therefore is by nature imprisoned under the law of sin, unless he is regenerated by a creative act of God, so that the sinful qualities of the flesh perish.[1] From this point of view it is easy to understand the principle of the Apostle that

[1] Parallels between Paul's and Philo's views of human nature are interesting (cf. Lüdemann, Anthropologie des Paulus, p. 103, seq.). In Philo, too, we see *νοῦς* and *διάνοια* engaged in a struggle with sensuality (here called *σῶμα, τὰ πάθη, ἡδοναί, ἐπιθυμίαι* or *σάρξ*), generally ending in the victory of the *latter*. De Migr. Abr. pp. 438, 440; Quod Deus s. immut. pp. 281, 293, seq.; De Gigant. pp. 266, 267. Yet man has from the outset the means of subduing the *σάρξ, if he only wills it*. The *πνοὴ Ζωῆς* in the nostril of the earthly Adam immediately gave the *νοῦς φθαρτός* the *πνεῦμα θεῖον* (Leg. Alleg. p. 50; Mundi Opif. p. 32), which, according to Paul, is only given to earthly man after his re-birth, according to the type of the heavenly Adam. Paul considers man incapable of fulfilling the law because he denies human nature *per se* this *πνεῦμα θεῖον*, while the Hellenist philosopher, in this a better Jew, believes human nature capable of fulfilling the law. The state before the awakening of the discriminating faculty is called by Philo childlike innocence. "As long as the divine Word has not entered the soul, its works are free from guilt; unconscious sins, not undeserving of pardon" (Quod Deus s. immut. p. 293). Paul says of the same state: "Without the law, sin is dead. For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived and I died," Rom. vii. 8, 9. Therefore in Paul's view also the state before the law entered into consciousness is a "life," but only because the subject is unconscious of death. Works done in this state, however, are by no means worthy of divine pardon, but are unholy, impure, an abomination before God, like all things that proceed from *σάρξ*. The condition of childlike innocence ends for Philo with the seventh year (Quis rer. div. heres. p. 515), for at that age the *πνεῦμα θεῖον* in man becomes conscious of the antithesis between the will of God and the will of the flesh (Leg. Alleg. pp. 46, 47). In Paul this moment comes when the law enters the human consciousness (Rom. vii.). But while in Philo the *νοῦς* is free and incurs death by conscious yielding to the flesh (*θάνατον τὸν ἐπὶ τιμωρίᾳ*, Leg. Alleg. p. 65), in Paul the *νοῦς* is subject to the flesh, and procures him no more than the consciousness of being therefore liable to death. In the latter case, then, the difference between Philo and Paul stands thus: with Philo the *πνεῦμα θεῖον* belongs to human nature as an original dower, while Paul reserves the notion of the *πνεῦμα θεῖον* for the doctrine of Christ (Lüdemann, op. cit. p. 105), and does not allow the believer to participate in it until the new birth after the type of the *δεύτερος Ἀδάμ*. Thus the theories of human nature in Philo and Paul are combinations, in different proportions, of Platonic and Jewish thought. Philo draws more from the Greek source, Paul more from the Jewish.

no flesh is justified by works of the law, considering that it is impossible for any flesh to fulfil these works.

The law, therefore, contributes absolutely no aid to a state of justification. To work righteousness, the law would not merely have to tell man what God wills, but also to impart to him a portion of the divine spirit which alone is fitted to produce godly works. Only thus would man have an instrument for accomplishing things spiritual. But the law does not possess this power. This is precisely the point, according to Rom. viii. 3, in which the law was weak, and where the means it offered failed.[1] The law can indeed prescribe a godly life, but cannot impart the divine spirit, and therefore cannot contribute towards godly works.

The causes of this deficiency are treated in detail by Paul in 2 Cor. iii. 3, seq. The law remains outside man; but though it holds up to him the mirror of God's will, so that he sees his own deformity and shrinks away in terror, it makes no change in him. For its essence is not spirit, but written words; it does not induce a vivifying inspiration in our hearts, but remains a table of stone with writing written in ink, which terrifies but does not change us. The law brings us death instead of life, by enlightening us upon our state of contrariety to God, without offering us the possibility of escape from it. Therefore, the service of the law is a service of death. The written letter kills; only the spirit from the other world gives life. Thus from the law we receive a spirit of bondage which intimidates us, for we fall under the curse which it denounces against our sins, and which yet we cannot evade.[2]

It can be seen that in this melancholy view of the law Paul has arrived at an inverted Pharisaism. Even so the law remains one of the chief factors of his scheme of things; but instead of the blessing of Israel, he sees in it the curse of God. He had laboured too long in the hope of attaining righteousness by the law to simply break with it after his conversion or come to

[1] Cf. also Gal. iii. 2, 5. [2] Rom. viii. 15, iv. 5; Gal. iii. 10.

terms with it from without. Instead of this, he draws unreservedly upon the results of his sojourn under the law, in order to incorporate his experience into his system; for men of thoughtful temper, like him, live through no experience in vain.

But at this point of view he could not but be confronted by the question, To what end has God, then, given this law, if not to bring us into a state of righteousness?

The answer given by Paul upon the basis of his experience is the most radical conceivable. God gave us the law, not to prevent sin, but to increase it. Paradoxical as this may sound, it only records what effects the law produced in reality; and Paul concludes from it that these are the very results God intended to offer humanity. So far the Apostle restricts himself to description. Once, indeed, he infers from the publication of the law being given, that men passed from their innate but unconscious state of sin to conscious opposition to the divine command,[1] by now learning God's will and yet having to act against it. Thus sin rises to conscious transgression, and this qualitative advance implicitly involves an objective advance, for the express prohibition arouses desire where it would have slumbered if undisturbed. "I had not known lust,[2] except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet; but sin, finding occasion, wrought in me through the commandment all manner of coveting, for apart from the law sin is dead. And I was alive apart from the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived and I died; for sin, finding occasion, through the commandment beguiled me, and through it slew me." It was therefore through the law that sin grew in responsibility and extent, and became the preponderant force it is. The law, it follows, is the special strength of sin,[3] for it wrought lust upon lust, conscious perversion from God, and with it eternal death.

What, then, always remained with Paul was the *negative* of the Pharisaic estimate of the law, with the result that he regarded

[1] Rom. vii. 7, v. 20; Gal. iii. 19.

[2] Rom. vii. 7.

[3] 1 Cor. xv. 56.

it as the most important historical preparation in the history of mankind. Such moral development as he perceives (in his eyes, of course, a downward development) is traceable to the influence of the law, which determined the fortune of mankind more profoundly than any other historical event. So far it can be said that in his theory the Apostle ascribes to the law greater importance than did even the Judaists who observed it. Though it produces sin, Paul declares it expressly to be holy, spiritual and good;[1] for whatever its consequences may be, our consciousness must assent to its demands as something good. Thus the objects attainable by the law are actually such as God wills, only they do not consist in the justification of man. This is anything but the effect of the law; on the contrary, it holds us fast in sin, so that no flesh can be justified but by the Messianic grace reserved by God for the latter days.

Although, then, the law is holy, that is to say, willed by God, its aim once more must not be rationalized; the law must not be simply considered to increase sin in order to bring us to consciousness of our need for salvation, or to heighten our longing for it, or to break down our confidence in our own powers. This would be the function of the spirit, and would oppose the principle that the law works the increase of lust and moral death. It is not for the law to develop in man a condition which fits him for salvation; for the development initiated by the law can only lead further and further from God, so that mankind was never less ready for grace than when the time was fulfilled. Otherwise men would never have hanged the Messiah on the cross.

The real object of the law was simply to keep mankind in sin, so that the justification prepared by God, and none other, should come to pass. God willed to justify mankind through the salvation brought by himself, through faith and grace. Therefore he removed every other path to a state of righteousness, by giving men a law whereby they plunged ever deeper into sin. "Before

[1] Rom. vii. 13.

faith came," it is said in Gal. iii. 23, "we were kept in ward under the law." The law was our taskmaster, keeping us in slavery to sin; the gaoler who drove us back into the prison of sin whenever we sought to escape, uttering his malicious cry: "Thou shall not covet; but sin, finding occasion, wrought in me all manner of coveting."

Thus the law served grace in guise of the gaoler who watches prisoners during an amnesty, and takes care that they do not escape. For they are to owe their liberty simply and solely to grace. Nay, this gaoler must only make his prisoners worse by daily provocations, that they may not even inwardly merit grace, and that grace may be nothing more than grace freely offered to them.

A conception that makes God the originator of all sin that has ever been, could only be based upon a far-reaching and all-embracing sense of dependence. All the harshness of antique thought and the grandeur of the Jewish conception of God speak in these hard sayings, which hold the happiness and unhappiness of generations as nothing before the majesty of the divine purpose; and where God stands so high that it abates nothing from reverence if His purposes plunge a sinful world still deeper into its sin, in order that the whole world may appear sinful and God alone bring salvation.

Yet who would say that the accent of personal experience cannot be discerned here in the grand subjection of self which sees everything from God's point of view, the unconditional sense of dependence which feels itself the handiwork of God, and has no complaint to offer against its potter? Or that after the unnumbered hours of Paul's earnest struggle to satisfy all the demands of the law, only to encounter more painful experiences, only to learn the full meaning of lust, and finally to bring upon himself nothing but blood-guiltiness and unimaginable burdens of conscience, did not this personal experience of his contribute to his hard conception of the law? Certain it is, at all events, that the law was still a leading problem for his

reflection, and that so sombre a conception of a once divine ordinance implies his own shipwreck, and not a mere dialectical process.

---

5. The Messiah as the Second Adam.

If, as has been seen, the law was not instituted to bring mankind to a state of justification before God, some other preparation to this end must necessarily be found, for God would never have created mankind to be unrighteous for all time. By himself, however, man cannot initiate the process in the flesh. His knowledge of the law and the agreement of his "inward man" with the law are not sufficient to conquer the flesh. Hence an objective intercession of God is needful to make the man after the flesh into a man after God. A more effectual embodiment of the spiritual principle is required than the law had shown itself to be. This is the Messiah. He it is for whom the task of justification was reserved. Before the days of Damascus, Paul was convinced that "the Messiah will come *as soon as* Israel is righteous;" now he felt, "the Messiah has come *to make mankind righteous.*"

If the Messiah was to fulfil this purpose, he must lend mankind a divine spirit that will counteract the impulses of the flesh and enable man to lead a life after God, i.e. a spiritual life. Now to imbue fleshly humanity with spiritual life from the spiritual world is such a change in the condition of man that henceforward he is "a new creature." Dust and earth before, given over to corruption, he has now the earnest of the spirit, a pledge from the other world assuring him of eternal life.[1] From a sinful creature, subject to the lusts of the flesh and liable to death and corruption, this breath from the other world turns

[1] 2 Cor. v. 5; for it follows from 1 Cor. v. 5 that even the *πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπου*, although *πνεῦμα*, is yet subject to corruption unless associated with the *πνεῦμα θεοῦ*.

him into a godly, sanctified and immortal being; wherefore this act of imparting the spirit is nothing short of the new creation of man. Mankind created after the earthly man could not have the divine spirit, for their ancestor Adam himself had only a living soul. Thus mankind needed to be fashioned anew after the type of another and a spiritual Adam, to live as a new creature, with new organs, after new laws of life.[1] Nothing short of some such total regeneration of human nature could deliver man from the bondage of the flesh; and this was the very purpose for which the Messiah was appointed by God, for it is said of him long ago in Genesis: "He became a life-giving spirit" (1 Cor. xv. 45).

It is clear, therefore, from the general lines of his theory of human nature, that Paul identified the Messiah with the heavenly Adam. In the opinion of the Pharisees, the Messianic kingdom could only come to a righteous people. But man can only become righteous if entirely regenerated. Therefore the Messiah must come as a second Adam, the initiator of a new humanity. While some expected the Messiah as a second David, a leader and king, the lion of the house of Judah, the rider on the white horse, the prince of victory who breaks the heathen in pieces like the potter's vessels,—while others, again, conceived of him as a second Moses, the shepherd and lawgiver, the ministering servant of humanity, in brief, as a teacher and prophet,—Paul conceives of him as a second ADAM, after whose type man must be re-fashioned to a new creature. It is in this sense only that he connects him with the heavenly man of the book of Daniel, to show the Messiah as the ancestor of a new humanity.

But the type of the Messiah in Daniel invited such a rendering, and the Jewish school appears to have been acquainted with it already. It has been shown before how Daniel's Son of Man, even if intended by the writer of the book to be only a representative of the Messianic kingdom, soon took shape in the popular consciousness as the Messiah himself. Thus in the fifth

[1] 2 Cor. v. 17.

book of the Sibyl we find a Jewish oracle which clearly demonstrates the fact.[1] As early as this the Messiah is figured as a heavenly man no less than the Son of Man, for the poet sings:

> "Blest, from the realms of heaven descends a Man,
> And in his hands a sceptre given of God."[2]

Similarly, the Greek Bible, by referring Ps. lxxi. (lxxii.) to the Messiah, said of him, he should live "as long as the sun and he existed before the moon."[3] The same thing occurs in the translation of Ps. cx. 3, where, among other manifestations of favour, the Hebrew text promises the king who is addressed: "From the womb of the morning thou hast the dew of thy youth;" while the Septuagint, referring the psalm to the Messiah, makes the psalmist lay down the doctrine that God produced the Messiah from his inward parts before the "dawn of the morning." Conversely, in a really Messianic passage, Is. ix. 6, the Septuagint makes the Messiah the angel of the assembling of God's council, while in the same verse the Targum Jonathan introduces the eternal continuance of the Messiah.[4]

On the other hand, as soon as a heavenly and an earthly Adam were distinguished in the double account of the creation in Genesis—for instance, by Philo—it was natural to see in the heavenly Adam that radiant form of man which God created as the first creature, before the sun and the moon and the stars of the morning. Philo, indeed, could hardly avoid this combination; it forces itself upon his assumption of a heavenly man. At the same time he effected the synthesis of the heavenly Adam and the Platonic ideal man, introduced by him into the account in

[1] Sib. v. 514, seq. For the pre-Christian origin of this passage, cf. Langen, Judenth. z. Zeit. Chr. p. 405; Friedlieb, p. xlvi, seq.

[2] The οὐρανίων νώτων ἀνὴρ μακαρίτης is both the heavenly man of the Hellenists and the Son of Man of the Hebrews.

[3] Ps. lxxii. 7, 17.

[4] Cf. Gfrörer, Urchr. i. 2, p. 296, seq.; Langen, Das Judenth. z. Zeit. Chr. p. 395, seq.

Genesis. "Mighty," says he,[1] "is the difference between man as formed in this time, and man as once begotten in the image of God. The former is perceptible to the senses, of particular properties, consisting of body and soul, is man or woman and by nature perishable; man, on the contrary, after the image of God is an idea or generic notion, pure form, a thought, immaterial, neither man nor woman, by nature imperishable."

On similar lines he elsewhere distinguishes two kinds of men.[2] "One is the heavenly man, the other the earthly. The heavenly man, as begotten after the image of God, has no part in transitory things or any earthly existence. On the other hand, the man of earthly origin was formed of dispersed matter, called by God a clod of earth. Therefore the heavenly man has no image, but is a copy of God; and the earthly man is something formed, not begotten (πλάσμα, ἀλλ' οὐ γέννημα)." This is exactly the distinction drawn by Paul between the heavenly and the earthly man. The former is a life-giving spirit, the latter a living soul; the former is of the light substance of God, the latter of flesh; the former incorruptible, the latter of earth and earthy.[3]

There was but one basis on which this distinction could grow up between the two Adams of the two-fold account of the creation, whereby the notion of man found realization in a double form of existence, and this basis was Platonism. The Jewish distinction between earth and heaven here passes over into the Platonic distinction between the sensible and the intelligible world. From the heavenly man and the earthly Adam springs the antithesis of the idea of man in the fields of truth and its realization in the realm of phenomena, where the ideal form of man separates into these earthly divisions of man and woman, black and white, Greek and barbarian.

Now if Greek thought again ascribed reality and a new materiality to this intelligible world, so as to make it stand above

[1] De Opif. Mundi, Mang. p. 32. [2] Leg. Alleg. Mang. p. 49.
[3] Gal. ii. 20, iv. 4, 6; 2 Cor. i. 19; Rom. v. 10, viii. 3, 29, 32.

this terrestrial world as a higher world of light, how much more was the same true of Jewish thought, for which heaven and paradise, the new Jerusalem, the Messianic temple, the heavenly man and all other heavenly beings, are not mere abstractions, but actual figures revealed in the Scripture, which have been beheld by many observers and have confirmed their existence in a thousand ways.[1]

Paul, for his part, not only further materialized this conception of the heavenly man by combining it with Jesus of Nazareth, but in particular brought it into closer connection with the actual Scripture than Philo. The chief passage for Paul's theory of Christ is 1 Cor. xv. 45, seq. According to this there is a double form in which man exists, because God created a heavenly Adam in the spiritual world, Gen. i. 26, and formed an earthly Adam of a clod for this sensible world, Gen. ii. 7. The earthly Adam first took visible shape, although created last. For the law holds good, according to 1 Cor. xv. 46, that the coarser forms of matter precede the finer. First come the physical, then the spiritual. Thus, too, the earthly Adam came before the heavenly.

This first Adam, the ancestor and begetter of all mankind, in whom they were included and whose existence and actions therefore represent all mankind, was of the earth, earthy; he had no immortal spirit, possessing (according to the very expression of the Scripture, Gen. ii. 7) nothing but a "living soul" for this sensible embodiment. Thus he was "flesh and blood," "corruptible," subject to death.[2]

On the other hand, the Adam of the spiritual world, called the second Adam from his later appearance in the world, was, like Philo's heavenly man, created after the likeness of God.[3] He was therefore a "life-giving spirit"[4] also, "spirit" pure and simple.[5] He, too, like all heavenly beings, has bodily shape,

[1] Cf. Holsten, Evang. des Paulus u. Petrus, p. 74.
[2] 1 Cor. xv. 44—50; Rom. v. 12, seq.
[3] 2 Cor. iv. 4.
[4] 1 Cor. xv. 45.
[5] 2 Cor. v. 17.

but spiritual. His body is one not made with hands, an eternal house,[1] possessing a very different glory from terrestrial bodies, and having for substance the glory of God, which shines around the eternal majesty.[2] The heavenly Adam is therefore a being which existed in heaven before the creation of the world,[3] clothed upon with a body of light, and corresponding exactly to the heavenly man of Philo and Enoch's Son of Man.

As this heavenly being has no fleshly body, he has no place for sin. He is sinless; and while sin entered the terrestrial world by the first conscious act of the first man, when the first Adam took the forbidden fruit of the tree of knowledge, desiring in his pride "to be as God,"[4] this heavenly man, "being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God,"[5] but continued in the rank assigned to him, and even gave it up when this was demanded by God for the salvation of mankind.

Granted that this touch is to be explained by Gen. iii. 5, it is unconscious Platonism again to assume that he is superior to all distinctions of humanity as it is, separated into Jew and Greek, bond and free, man and woman, by the incapacity of matter to take up the original archetypes into itself. All these contradictions disappear for the second Adam, for they merely belong to the "flesh." The heavenly man is not only raised above the opposition between races and nations, but is also sexless, like the angels; for when an individual is regenerated after him, he is no more man or woman, Jew or Greek.[6]

In Christ, therefore, circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing,[7] and it is folly to make it to one's own honour, "for he shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation that it may be conformed to the body of his glory."[8]

Therefore those that marry also are as though they did not

[1] 2 Cor. v. 1.
[2] 1 Cor. xv. 40; 2 Cor. iv. 4, 6.
[3] 1 Cor. viii. 6, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα.
[4] Gen. iii. 5, ἔσεσθε ὡς θεοί.
[5] Phil. ii. 6.
[6] Gal. iii. 28.
[7] 1 Cor. vii. 19.
[8] Phil. iii. 19, 21.

marry;[1] "for they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage, for they are equal unto the angels and are the children of God."[2] Hence the heavenly man, the archetype of those that are glorified, is free from all distinctions of sex and nationality and every other earthly mark of difference. He only bears the essential, generic attributes of human nature. He is the ideal, yet real, form of man which takes shape in this world of flesh in different sexes and ages and races and conditions.

Here too, then, the heavenly Adam of the Apostle appears as Philo's heavenly man, who is the likeness of God, "free from particular attributes, only idea or genus, incorporeal, neither man nor woman."[3] And in the last resort, unknown indeed to the Jewish schools, this Messiah is Plato's ideal man, who lives in the abode of pure forms and is given a spherical shape by Alcibiades in the Symposium.

Meanwhile, since the heavenly man is but one among the heavenly forms which dwell round about God, for there are other heavenly bodies whose glory differs like that of the sun, the moon and the stars,[4] the question rises as to the position taken among the rest by this heavenly being. A later section of the book of Enoch makes the heavenly Son of Man created before all other starry spirits,[5] and sees him surrounded "by all the cherubim and seraphim and ophanim, by all the angels of power and all angels of dominion, and the chosen, and the other powers which are upon the firmament over the waters."[6]

These ideas are approached most nearly by the account of the Christ in the Epistle to the Colossians, where Christ is called "the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature. For by him were all things created that are in heaven and that

[1] 1 Cor. vii. 29.
[2] Luke xx. 35, 36.
[3] Philo, De Opif. Mundi, Mang. 32.
[4] 1 Cor. xv. 40.
[5] Enoch xlviii. 3.
[6] Enoch lxi. 10.

are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things were created by him and for him."[1] So too in 1 Cor. viii. 6: "To us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things."

At all events it is beyond doubt that in Paul's view the heavenly man has a similar position among the spirits of heaven as Enoch's Son of Man. Paul, too, conceives of the heavenly bodies as living beings, and describes them as the guardians of pre-Christian humanity, to whom the Gentiles offered direct worship; while the Jews were enslaved to them indirectly by their new moons and festivals, until Christ put an end to this worship of the subordinate æons, showing by this act that he precedes them all.[2]

Thus the heavenly man is in a particular and special sense the bearer of the divine glory, which the angels are not;[3] the the image of God,[4] which the angels are not; the "own" Son of God, which again the angels are not.[5] The height at which he stands above all other heavenly beings shows rather that he and his are designed some day to judge the angels.[6] Hence, according to the theology both of Paul and of the Pharisees, the heavenly man is the first of heavenly beings, just as the earthly man is the first of earthly beings. As the latter is the crown of creation, the former is the flower of heaven. According to the prophet Daniel, in whom the Messiah comes as the heavenly man upon the clouds of heaven, he was appointed to convert men to a state of righteousness, that is to say, to glorify them into a spiritual humanity after his own image, so as to make way for the spiritual, which, according to the eternal law of the universe, is to follow the physical.[7]

[1] Col. i. 15.

[2] Gal. iv. 3 and iii. 19; 1 Cor. xv. 41. Holtzmann, Judenth u. Christenth. p. 554.

[3] 2 Cor. iv. 6. [4] 2 Cor. iv. 4. [5] Rom. viii. 32.

[6] 1 Cor. vi. 3, xv. 27. [7] 1 Cor. xv. 46.

So far, then, as a new humanity is created through him and in his image, he is the second Adam. For this purpose the world was established from the beginning. "That was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly."[1]

With this the critical step was taken which transferred Jesus from the realm of humanity to an absolutely distinct sphere of divine potentialities. Highly as the Galilean church honoured the Messiah of whom all the holy singers and prophets had prophesied, and whom they themselves expected to return upon the clouds of heaven, he did not take absolutely divine shape until Paul applied the Rabbinical doctrine of the Christ to Jesus of Nazareth. But this also made it possible for Hellenistic Judaism and the Gentile craving after reconciliation, directed by Platonism, to see in the Man of Galilee the mediator between this world and the beyond. As for the name of the Logos, in which the Porch personified the spiritual principle of the world, and Philo the activity of God creating and maintaining the universe, Paul does not actually express it; but except for the word, Philo's speculative theories have now become positive religion in the school of Paul.

---

6. The New Manhood.

The deep meaning of the doctrine of the new Adam was, as we have seen, that through Christ humanity casts off its old nature and is transformed into a new creature. Nothing less was necessary to bring man into a state of justification. But

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 46—49.

there are various factors to be distinguished in this act of new creation.

Legal ordinances and God's word in the law required satisfaction to be given for all the sins of mankind since Adam. On the other hand, the deficiency of human nature required to be endowed with a spiritual organ, strong enough to restrain the sinful impulses of the flesh. In either case, the heavenly man was bound to enter into closer connection with human nature; to assume it himself, to become flesh.[1]

The only way in which Paul could conceive of this "becoming flesh" was for the heavenly man to assume an actual body of sinful flesh, with all its evil inclinations; for if, as Paul presupposes, the sin of the flesh is to be punished in his body, this body also must consist of the actual flesh of sin.[2] Yet it need hardly be said that, though the Messiah puts on the sinful physical basis of humanity, he never comes to actual transgression. The objective sinfulness which involves neither personal responsibility nor conscious sin, was of course given with his putting on of the flesh, and so far Christ was "made to be sin"[3] for us. Still in his case there never was actual transgression of the law. Christ, indeed, puts on the sinful flesh; but as he is "spirit," the flesh in him is in bondage, just as the "inward man" is in bondage in those who have not been saved, so that in Christ it is the flesh which is forced to do that which it wills not.

Thus the introduction of the spiritual principle into human nature is not based upon the godly life of the heavenly man in earthly flesh. At all events, Paul has never intimated how far the life of Jesus aided this object. He only insists that Christ really fulfilled the law; that he knew no sin, and therefore

[1] Rom. i. 3.

[2] As is clear from 2 Cor. v. 21, viii. 9, in spite of the important expression in Rom. viii. 3; cf. Pfleiderer, Zeitschr. für Wissen. Theol. 1871, p. 525, seq.

[3] 2 Cor. v. 21.

suffered death, not as a punishment of his own guilt, but vicariously.[1]

But the decisive point was the death of Jesus, not his life. This is Paul's starting-point everywhere; the death and resurrection are everywhere among the first points of doctrine which he lays down for the churches.[2] Indeed, the death of Jesus has a two-fold meaning for Paul. It brings at once forgiveness for former sins and death to the old principle of sin.

With regard to the former, Rom. iii. 21—26 particularly explains that mankind is freely justified in Jesus of his grace, in that God made him a propitiation for sin, so that bygone sins did not remain unpunished—an idea which Pharisaic thought would have found incompatible with the idea of divine justice. Such was the immediate effect of the Messiah's death, inasmuch as Christ took the threatened penalty upon himself as the sin-offering, and endured the curse in our behoof, thus ransoming us who had become liable to the law.[3] This theory of satisfaction, still permeating the categories of Pharisaic thought, was aided by two Old Testament ideas in particular. First, the idea of SACRIFICE. Sin can be atoned for vicariously by sacrifice. In this sense Paul says the Messiah was slain as our Paschal Lamb, to take the guilt from us.[4] The same interpretation was further enforced by the type of Jehovah's suffering servant, whose affliction is described as vicarious in Isaiah lii. and liii. When, therefore, Paul says, in 1 Cor. xv. 3, that Christ died for our sins according to the scripture, he can only mean by this "scripture" the above prophecy, in which the Christian Church found a perfect explanation of the reason why Christ had such sufferings to endure before entering into his glory.

On these two factors rests the Pauline theory of satisfaction, which turned the doctrine of faith in the middle ages and at the Reformation into a one-sided doctrine of justification. For in reality vicarious satisfaction stands only on the outskirts, and

[1] 1 Cor. v. 21; Phil. ii. 7.
[2] Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 3.
[3] 2 Cor. v. 21; Rom. iii. 25; Gal. iii. 13.
[4] 1 Cor. v. 7.

not at the centre, of the Pauline doctrine of salvation. The essence of the saving process is not that Christ has paid for our old guilt, but that he has put us in a condition to live hereafter without guilt.

Now this takes place by the subduing of the flesh, the sinful physical basis, from whose oppression the death of Christ has freed us. Just as mankind became subject to death in the first Adam, being contained and represented in him when he sinned, this new spiritual humanity is represented in the second Adam, in whose image they are re-created.[1] What, then, happened to the second Adam, happened to the new mankind in him. What happened to Christ, happened objectively to the whole of the new humanity which has "united" with him, and whose "spirit" is an effluence of his spirit. As Levi, who was free from the tithe, yet paid tithes while still in the loins of his father Abraham, for Abraham paid tithe to Melchisedec;[2] as the unborn generations sinned in Adam, their ancestor, while he still represented the whole of mankind,[3]—so for all the new humanity the sin of the flesh is destroyed in the body of Christ. "Our old man is crucified with Christ, that the body of sin might be destroyed that henceforth we should not serve sin."[4]

This mystical influence upon our sinful body of the destruction of the body of sin on Golgotha, depends upon Christ being our Adam, in whom we are all contained. This introduces the words: "As by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men .... much more the grace of God by the grace of one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many."[5]

This mystical connection may be imagined upon the analogy of the mysterious relation between the types of the other world and their earthly copies. It is here strikingly accentuated by the fact that the ideal man himself enters the world of sense to aid those who are created after his image. At all events, the

[1] Rom. v. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 49. [2] Heb. vii. 10. [3] Rom. v. 12.
[4] Rom. vi. 6, vii. 4. [5] Rom. v. 12—19.

question here is clearly not so much of a purely legal relation between Christ's death and our guilt, than of the conception of a mystical union between the Church of the Messiah and the Messiah himself, so that the effects produced upon his sinful flesh by his death actually pass over upon those who are created after his image, just as Adam's descendants were mysteriously accursed with him in the consequences of Adam's primal sin. "Because one died for all, therefore all died; and he died for all that they which live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who for their sakes died and rose again. . . . . If any man is in Christ, he is a new creature; the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new. But all things are of God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ."[1]

Now this transference to us of the consequences of Jesus' death is effected by the positive gift brought by Christ to his humanity. For the influences of the grace of Christ are exhausted neither in the extirpation of the sin-guiltiness resting upon our race, nor in the extinction of the power of sin established in our flesh. Christ, indeed, did not merely die, and so condemn sin and kill it in his flesh, he also rose again in a spiritual body, and thus procured the new humanity a share in the spiritual world. The new mankind shares in his resurrection as in his death, because, being "united" with him, they have become one body with him.[2] As the old manhood experiences all the processes of the first Adam, so the new manhood with the second Adam; and as the latter by his resurrection changed from the fleshly to the spiritual Adam, so from the manhood which is simply called "flesh" there grew up in him a new manhood which is in "the spirit."

For this, Christ was appointed from the beginning, and for this reason God made him "a life-giving spirit."[3] With his glorification Christ becomes once more pure spirit,[4] and spiritual influences pass from him to mankind. Whoever belongs to him

[1] 2 Cor. v. 15—18.
[2] Rom. vi. 3—14.
[3] 1 Cor. xv. 45.
[4] 2 Cor. iii. 17.

is not in the flesh, but in the spirit,[1] and is transformed from glory to glory, as is only to be expected from the Lord, who is spirit.[2]

"In Christ," therefore, and "in the spirit," are absolutely identical ideas. The characteristic of the new manhood, therefore, rests essentially on the fact that it possesses the holy spirit, and is thus put in a position to conquer the flesh. Now at last it belongs to the higher order of the world, which alone is holy, pure and immortal; it has life in itself, and is removed from the law of sin and corruption.

Now the moment at which the heavenly spirit of the new manhood was conceived, was the resurrection, when the second Adam cast off his fleshly vesture and put on the spiritual.[3] "If we died with Christ, we were also buried with him, that like as Christ was raised from the dead, so we also might walk in newness of life. For if we have become united with the likeness of his death, we shall be also with the likeness of his resurrection; knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be done away, that so we should no longer be in bondage to sin."[4]

As, therefore, his life did away with our guilt, as his death slew our flesh, so his glorification to the spirit also helped us to the spirit. Consequently, the profound saying of the second Adam is not merely symbolic, but has a distinct metaphysical significance. A second ancestor is provided that a new mankind may arise. For a new manhood dominated by the heavenly spirit, as the old manhood was dominated by the sinful flesh, is actually a new creature; and so Paul himself applied the word of the creation to this new genesis, "Let there be light."[5]

Now this new creation is objectively realized through the death and resurrection of the Messiah. But that this new creation should take place in the individual, subjective assimilation is necessary, and this is effected in the new birth of the man,

[1] Rom. viii. 9. [2] 2 Cor. iii. 18. [3] Rom. vi. 3.
[4] Rom. vi. 4, seq. [5] 2 Cor. iv. 6.

whereby he becomes a "new creature." As we become fleshly men by the first birth, after the image of the first Adam, so we must become spiritual men by a second birth, after the image of the second Adam. For such a second birth, however, it is not necessary, as Nicodemus thought, to enter again into the mother's womb. The question is not of a new birth of the flesh, but of the entrance of the spirit into man. This is an inward act, that no eye can see and no ear hear.

This new birth is effected by faith and baptism. Here is a point in which Pauline theology touches the principle of Jesus' teaching. Faith is the means by which man attains righteousness and admission to the kingdom of God. As Jesus describes the kingdom as a condition of the inward man, so Paul makes everything depend upon faith, i.e. confidence in God's acts of salvation. What Jesus, then, called the new commandment, the greatest commandment, trustful love of the Father, Paul defines as confidence in faith.

Paul, too, especially in view of the former method of the law, expressly referred to faith as a subjective inward principle.[1] When Jesus said, "The kingdom of God is within you," this was precisely righteousness by faith. The inner being is the true being which holds good before God. Thou needest not to sail over the sea, says a passage of Scripture, which Paul puts in the mouth of righteousness,[2]—thou needest not to ascend to listen at the keyhole of heaven, nor descend to hearken at the gates of hell,—"the word is nigh thee in thy heart." If thou wilt find God, go to thine own heart.[3]

Yet, certainly, as in Paul's conception of faith we pass from the sphere of God's purely objective preparations to the sphere of man's subjective co-operation, here once more everything rests with God and not with our will and volition. In the first place, the Pauline "faith" is not to be modernized as some kind of harmonious condition of soul into which we ought to transfer

[1] 2 Cor. iii. 6, seq. [2] Rom. x. 6.

[3] Cf. Lang, Ein Gang durch d. Chr. Welt. p. 39.

ourselves, which carries its promise in itself and so far makes man righteous. Faith which can stand before God is rather the positive conviction that the death of the Messiah obliterated our sins and established the conditions for our righteousness.

Thus the fundamental conception of Pauline faith is plainly trust in God, and so far a subjective state of the human mind.[1] But this confidence has a thoroughly objective significance. It is trust in God's miraculous power to give us grace through Christ. According to Rom. x. 9, he shall be saved "who shall confess with his mouth Jesus as Lord, and shall believe in his heart that God raised him from the dead." Or, as it is expressed in Rom. iv. 24, "unto whom it shall be reckoned, who believe on him that raised Jesus our Lord from the dead, who was delivered up for our trespasses and was raised for our justification."

The faith that justifies has therefore a perfectly definite significance, and the "zeal for God" which Paul attests even among the Jews[2] is quite incapable of producing justification before God. But the fact that Paul does not simply speak of faith in Jesus, but specifically of faith in him who rose from the dead, as the faith which justifies, is quite in harmony with the fact that he believed on him when risen and not when living. When his adversaries taunt him with having nothing to tell of the living Lord because he knew him not, he answers: "Though we have known Christ in the flesh, yet do we know him no more." The question can now be only of belief in him who has risen; and had Christ not risen, his life would not avail us—our faith would be vain.[3]

An immediate definition is therefore given to the subjective factor in justification; it attains not merely intensity of trust in God, for this Paul had while he was still a Pharisee, but rather the full significance of this trust; that is to say, faith in Jesus' Messiahship. A second restriction is, that God gives this faith

[1] Cf. Lipsius, Die Paul. Rechtfertigungslehre, p. 106, seq.
[2] Rom. x. 2. [3] 2 Cor. v. 16; 1 Cor. xv. 29, seq.

to whomsoever He will. As He laid hold on Paul himself as he went to Damascus and brought him to faith, so He reveals his Son to those only whom He has chosen to this end from their mother's womb. Far from being dropped, then, the Pharisaic belief in predestination is accentuated by Paul in the direction of Essenism.[1] This, indeed, was but the necessary consequence of the intensified conviction that the flesh is incapable of all spiritual actions, one of which is faith. The flesh, indeed, can only lust against the spirit, and is unable to comprehend it. To it the spirit is folly. How, then, should the flesh unaided arrive at the firm faith in God's saving power, which Paul calls faith? "So, then, it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that hath mercy."[2] He who has come to know God, was known of God before;[3] as for those who have not come to know Him, God himself has hardened their hearts like Pharaoh of Egypt,[4] or the god of this world "hath blinded their minds that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not dawn upon them."[5] The petty claims of individual men for equal treatment and equal right of salvation do not come under Paul's consideration. "I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion,"[6] are the words here; and if any find it incomprehensible that whole nations and even the chosen people should come into destruction, Paul replies: "Nay, but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why didst thou make me thus?"[7] God has chosen of His own will from the beginning who shall attain to faith, and so to participation in the new humanity. If, then, communion in faith prepared the way for inclusion in the new Adam, the new birth is perfected in the act of baptism.

The act of baptism is the means whereby our old man shares

[1] Cf. Time of Jesus, Vol. i. pp. 164, 165 (Eng. trans.).
[2] Rom. ix. 16, seq. [3] Gal. iv. 9. [4] Rom. ix. 17.
[5] 2 Cor. iv. 4. [6] Rom. ix. 15. [7] Rom. ix. 19, seq.

the suffering of Christ's death. By baptism we are buried in the death of Christ, in order to die out of the body of sin by mystical participation in this death.[1] As submersion is a similitude of this burial, so emergence from the water is an image of the glorifying resurrection. At baptism the spirit unites miraculously with man, so that he is equipped with a new organ, and emerges from the waters as a new creature void of sin. The mystic unity of the believer with Christ is completed. The old man is dead in whom the old Adam lived; a new one has come into being in whom Christ lives. We live, yet not we, but Christ lives in us. "Though we live in the flesh, yet we live in the spirit." "None of us liveth to himself, and none dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord."

Thus every single impulse of our new life proceeds from him, so that we appear no more than members of his body, attached to him at his will. Every believer is a member of his body, and the sum of believers is the body of Christ.[2] His heart beats in us,[3] his spirit thinks in us, his love constrains us;[4] we are in Christ, Christ is in us; so that man can only say, I am dead, but Christ lives in me. So far, then, we have actually become a new creation after the second Adam. Hand and foot and arm are unchanged, but another inward man has arisen, for we have the spirit, and the spirit is Christ.

Wonderfully as the new birth is completed by the act of baptism and the new creature called into being, from another side the process is still one of growth. In Gal. iv. 19, the Apostle speaks of Christ needing to be formed in us more and more. Even the regenerated is not made after Christ's image at one stroke; the image must mature. It will only be perfected after the resurrection, when we shall have shaken off the flesh and wear the outward semblance of the spiritual body of

[1] Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12.
[2] 1 Cor. vi. 15.
[3] Phil. i. 8.
[4] 2 Cor. v. 14.

Christ.[1] But the Apostle presupposes that this spiritual body undergoes a process of preparation in this life, because the "spirit," which has entered into us, is in itself something material and not bare force, with no underlying substance and immaterial. Therefore we bear this body within us already, and at our death it is the seed from which our future spiritual body germinates.[2]

When in later times the Johannine theology admits the notion that the body of Christ, received in the Lord's Supper, serves to nourish this spiritual body in us,[3] it perhaps expresses Pauline ideas here as elsewhere. As Paul warns those who eat the Lord's Supper unworthily of the consequences in bodily harm and destruction,—as, further, whosoever eats the body unworthily is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord,[4]—it follows that for Paul mystical influences are indubitably connected with tasting the body of Christ, and it is quite possible that Paul, too, connected the nourishment and growth of this spiritual body of light in us with the partaking of the spiritual body of Christ, which is given us in the Lord's Supper and which we are to "discern."

For the rest, to have our spiritual habitation laid up in heaven until we are clothed upon with it,[5] would not be opposed to this doctrine, as a partial union with it is effected even in this life.[6] In this case the sacramental action of the Lord's Supper, as well as that of baptism, would affect the growth of the spiritual in us, on which depends our salvation from the power of the flesh and our future entrance into the glorious world of the new Jerusalem.

But now heavenly and earthly have become one in us by the possession of the spirit; already we grasp the eternal life here below; we have taken up the eternal divine life through Christ in us; we have received the earnest of the other world, and on this side possess the beyond, thus bridging over the dualism

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 44, seq.
[2] 1 Cor. xv. 49, and 37—44.
[3] John vi. 48, seq.
[4] 1 Cor. xi. 23—30.
[5] 2 Cor. v. 1, seq.
[6] 2 Cor. iv. 16, seq.

which is the spiritual thorn of this age. The more sharply Paul opposes the two realms of sense and spirit, the more clearly he declares that the mediation sought by mankind is given in Christ.

7. The New World.

The doctrine of the function of the Messiah as taught by Paul is so exclusively directed to the renewal of human nature and the purification of the inward man, that the rational expectations of an outward and visible Messianic period only remain beside this psychological conception as something secondary, with no necessary inward connection. This is the reason why the Pauline doctrine of salvation supplied the basis for further doctrinal development in proportion as Christianity learned by experience that the fulfilment of the outward Messianic expectations was to be postponed to a distant day. The axiom that Jesus came to make us into different men remained unshaken, even when no one thought any longer of a Messianic revolution of the universe.

Yet Paul was far from having freed himself from this dream of his Pharisaic period. Everywhere he is instant with the warning that, to enter into the new and righteous manhood in which the promises of Scripture are to be fulfilled, God has left but a little time wherein preaching and baptism may be offered to all.[1] To complete the election by grace, a series of intermediate steps are still necessary, such as sending out preachers, proclaiming the gospel, conversion and baptism;[2] and so it happened that although Christ had already begun the new manhood and opened the resurrection as the "first-fruits," still a certain period intervenes between the glorification of the first-fruits and that of the new manhood.

Yet this interval will not last long; indeed, the more Chris-

[1] Rom. x. 6; 1 Cor. vii. 29, xv. 23. [2] Rom. x. 14.

tian missionary zeal hurries on the intermediate process of appealing to men, the shorter this interval will be. At the time of writing the Epistle to the Romans, Paul saw this stage practically completed. He considered it an accomplished fact that by that time the message of reconciliation had reached the ears of all men.[1] Naturally he had all the greater expectation of himself living to see the return of Jesus and the outward realization of the Messianic promises. Indeed, he thought of this fulfilment in strict accordance with the Scriptures, in essential harmony with Daniel and the eschatological sayings of Jesus, such as were current in the Church.

The Christ of the great hour might be expected at any moment, "for the day of the Lord cometh like a thief in the night. When they are saying, Peace and safety, then suddenly destruction cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with child."[2] The actual advent of Jesus will be fulfilled exactly as it is described in Daniel viii. 13. "The Lord himself," says Paul, "shall descend from heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first."[3]

Now this appearance of the Lord from on high and of the risen believers from below, follows after the glorification of the earthly bodies to spiritual bodies in the similitude of Christ. "We know"—such is the trust of the Apostle at this time—"that if the earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens. For verily in this we groan, longing to be clothed upon with our habitation which is from heaven, if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For indeed we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but that we would be clothed upon, that what is mortal may be swallowed up of life."[4]

Now this moment, longed for all his life by the Apostle,

[1] Rom. x. 21.
[2] 1 Thess. v. 2, based upon Matt. xxiv. 43.
[3] 1 Thess. iv. 16, seq.
[4] 2 Cor. v. 1—4.

oppressed by his "habitation," was the hour of the advent. "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. But when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall come to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory."[1]

After this hour of glorification, for which the Apostle yearns with peculiar longing, there follows the revelation of the heavenly Jerusalem, "that is above, and free, and is our mother."[2] "For our citizenship is in heaven; from whence also we wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory, according to the working whereby he is able even to subject all things unto himself."[3]

Now this subjugation of all powers which make against God is the special purpose to which the time of the kingdom is dedicated. This wider scope, it is true, is summed up in the brief words: "Christ must reign till he hath put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be abolished is death. For God put all things in subjection under His feet. And when all things have been subjected unto Him, then shall the Son also himself be subjected unto Him that did subject all things unto Him, that God may be all in all."[4]

The Apostle therefore regards the kingdom of God, as we hear in this passage, as anything but a mere festal day on which the saints carry palms and sing the Lamb; but as, in the old Jewish expectation of the kingdom, the Messiah is a prince of victory, who strives with and defeats the heathen powers in the last battle, and overthrows Gog and Magog, heathendom let loose in the ends of the earth, so, too, in Paul much is left for

[1] More correctly, "for ever," Isaiah xxv. 8.
[2] Gal. iv. 26. [3] Phil. iii. 20, seq. [4] 1 Cor. xv. 24, seq.

the returning Son of Man to do. He must reign till all his enemies are set under his feet; for him, too, the time of the kingdom is a period of strife. All powers and dominions and might, all influences counter to God, must be annihilated. Death, and man's turning away from God, and the corruptibility of the flesh, must be done away with. This terrestrial world must therefore be steeped in new vital powers and made spiritual. The creature, too, which is subject to corruption, shall, according to Rom. viii. 19, celebrate its glorification; and a faint premonition of this already passes through the souls of the dumb creation. "For I reckon," says Paul, "that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed to us-ward. For the earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God. For the creation was subjected to vanity, not of its own will, but by reason of him who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only so, but ourselves also, which have the first-fruits of the spirit; even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body."[1]

A process of universal change will therefore begin with the appearance of the Messiah, driving death out of this world, which means nothing more nor less than the substitution of the imperishable, heavenly, radiant element of the spiritual world for perishable matter and sinful flesh. The history of the kingdom of God will consequently be a process of spiritualization, of the subduing of matter and the flesh; and after the heavenly man, the likeness of God, has discharged this function of redeeming the world in the most comprehensive sense, he will re-unite himself to God, and God will be all in all.

[1] Rom. viii. 18—23.

Dualism, the problem of the world, is thus overcome.

Here, then, the antinomies in the views of the world then in vogue are bridged over at one skilful stroke. The reconciliation between the present and the beyond was provided for both the religious need and the thinking mind. Both elements, it follows, are represented in Paul: the advance in religious thought, made possible to Judaism by acquaintance with Platonism, and the deepening of the religious consciousness, which the Greek world drew from its contact with Judaism. The Rabbinical expectation of the kingdom had been belief in a coming period of salvation, to which man was aroused by God's power. The Messianic kingdom is a conception of this world as it shall be hereafter, not a world beyond, which is already in existence. Though the Jews, too, held that a world of light exists above this world, still it was not another world, but a higher stage of our own. Platonism, on the other hand, is the source of the idea of a world beyond, the home of God and ideas, of powers and souls, where our souls find their home when they have ended their wanderings.

Without, then, giving up belief in the coming kingdom, Paul was able to deepen it into belief in the world beyond. To him, the higher world is a world of the spirit, of power, light and life; in brief, of all the factors which go to make up the Platonic notion of the intelligible world. It is in undisguised antithesis to this world of the flesh and sin and darkness.

But the Pauline kingdom of heaven differs from the Platonic world of ideas in being able to enter this world of earth. This wedding of the higher and lower elements began with the appearance of the heavenly man: it will be completed with his final advent. Thus the Jewish belief in the coming kingdom of God simply becomes a factor in divesting the Platonic belief in a beyond of its absolute transcendence, so perplexing to the human mind. The world beyond is on the point of becoming the present world. Thus the pang of longing begins to be assuaged, without

putting an end to the longing which is the religious factor of the whole conception; on the contrary, it is intensified by the approach of its goal.

At the same time the ideas are everywhere so arranged that they could survive the disillusion of non-fulfilment. While Jewish belief expected the kingdom of heaven to come down to earth, and Platonic belief, the ascent of the soul to the realm of truth, Paul wisely takes an intermediate position. Firmly as the Jewish expectation of the kingdom remains with him in all its features, it is often associated with the thoroughly Platonic idea of translation into the kingdom of heaven, where a new heavenly body awaits us. Paul would go over to the beyond to dwell there with the heavenly man; his city is in heaven; he longs to depart and be with Christ.[1]

He comes to the enjoyment of the kingdom, not by the Jewish resurrection, but by Platonic return to the other world. Thus the kingdom does not come to his disciples; but that is of small importance to them, as they are themselves to be translated into the coming glory.

We meet, indeed, with opposing images; the First Epistle to the Thessalonians is almost symbolical in its interpretation of the question whether the kingdom of heaven descends to earth, as the Jews expect, or whether the soul ascends, as the Greeks say; according to this Epistle, both meet half-way. "We shall be caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord."[2]

Similarly, it is characteristic of this intermediate position that the Apostle clothes the Jewish dogma of resurrection at the Messianic redemption in the image of the grain of corn, with which the Eleusinian doctrines used to represent the continuance of the soul in another world. What Paul lays down in 1 Cor. xv. is throughout the theme of Demeter's worship; where the Eleusinian neophyte is forbidden to speak of it "because the great sorrow of the goddesses withholds speech,"

[1] 2 Cor. v. 4—9; Phil. iii. 20, i. 22, 23. [2] 1 Thess. iv. 17.

the Apostle states more expressly that he imparts a great "mystery" to his hearers. "That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die; and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not the body that shall be, but a bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other kind; but God giveth it a body even as it pleaseth Him, and to each seed a body of its own."[1]

Thus the Eleusinian symbol of immortality is taken by the Apostle as a symbol of the resurrection. What to the Greek signified life in another world, he applies to the return to a new age. His similes were therefore convertible to either side, and hence the fourth Evangelist builds upon a Pauline foundation, though his theology passes entirely to a Platonic basis by turning the coming kingdom of God into a superior world of spirit and ideas; teaching the Church to grasp eternal life in the temporal, and transforming all the paraphernalia of Jewish eschatology—resurrection, judgment and condemnation—into psychological processes. Here, too, we find, even more distinctly than in Paul, the belief in the kingdom as a belief in the beyond, which yet begins to be present. But this further development was only possible through Paul, whose theological ideas are presupposed by the fourth Evangelist on every point.

If a leader of thought is one in whose coin after generations reckon, Paul was such an one. His ideas influenced even those who rejected his practice. The conception of the personal Jesus as the heavenly man, the second Adam, the beginning of God's creation, the Paschal Lamb sacrificed for us, the first-born of the dead, exercised a power from which not even the anti-Pauline writer of the Apocalypse could escape. From Paul, the fourth Evangelist borrows the conception that the want in human nature is its want of the holy spirit; that it must be regenerated into a new creature in the baptism by water and the spirit; and that only after this new birth it receives something of the kingdom of God from above, and is in a position to live a new life.

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 36, seq.

Where he and later writers draw a sharp distinction between the children of light and darkness, those who are predestined to salvation or damnation, the whole doctrine of election by grace rests upon a Pauline foundation. The vast significance of these profound ideas in the history of mankind therefore represents the significance of Paul's thought, entirely apart from his missionary work. Pauline theology gave in its formulæ the solution which reconciled the divisions of contemporary thought, subduing dualism in the concrete form of religious doctrine. To thinkers it gave that religious certainty and belief in actuality which were lacking in Philo; to the Christian Church, an expression of their religious consciousness in terms of thought. For while it appeared inconceivable to us that a mere thought of universal mediation, such as Philo conceived, should give birth to a new religion, it was equally impossible for any religion to find a firm basis in a merely perceptive form of its experiences without systematic vindication and logical proof. This advance from the sense of reconciliation to the doctrine of reconciliation is expressed in Paul. He had the chief share in bringing the Christian Church to adopt this view of the universe rather than any other.

---

8. Religious Genius.

To grasp a man's theological system is not to realize his religious personality. Beyond the intellectual lies a personal somewhat, introduced into spiritual work by the genius for religion. Merely to string together a set of dry abstractions is to make a caricature, not a portrait, of Pauline theology. Yet these very ideas are but the expression of an inward life which still maintains vitality, while as ideas they are now for the most part unrealizable by our thought. But for Paul himself the chief point was not his system, which he nowhere develops continuously, but the wealth of feelings which led him to this

system. The sum of these feelings was the sense of dependence, that is to say, piety.

In the first place, this sense of dependence reveals itself as a sense of his personal unworthiness, a temperament to which Pharisaic asceticism and consciousness of his miraculous conversion may, in his case, have contributed. Not as though he had special sins to accuse himself of: "I know nothing against myself," he says (1 Cor. iv. 4), "yet am I not hereby justified." Just as Luther, night and day, could cry "Oh my sins! sins! sins!" and yet, when he went to confession, had no particular sin to confess, so the key-note of Paul's life was the sense of unworthiness before God, the consciousness of the weakness of the flesh, and the profound corruption of the human will, which constantly turns to baseness and drags down the spirit from the ideal. This serious conception of human imperfection is the characteristic of Paulinism. Whenever a serious reform of the Church has been attempted during eighteen centuries, it has invariably started from the spirit of the Apostle, inexorably stripping off the veil from our true inward state. This temper found theoretical expression in his uncompromising antithesis between flesh and spirit; in practice it was the oppressive sense of guilt, uttered in the cry: "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?"[1]

But this sense of dependence is not merely consciousness of personal unworthiness, but also an equally strong feeling of reconciliation accorded. Paul's certainty that he can effect nothing of himself is only equalled by his certainty that he can effect everything through Christ, who gives him strength. It is precisely this positive side of the pious sense of dependence that attained the strength of genius in him. When he says that he lives, yet not he, but Christ,—that he is compelled to follow God in triumph as a captive over the world,[2]—he uses figurative expressions for the strong sense of his inward subjection to the absolute divine will. Since the time of the prophets, none had

[1] Rom. vii. 14. [2] 2 Cor. x. 4, 5.

felt this compulsion of the divine thought so strongly as Paul. While man usually regards the operations of his being as his own free act, when he thinks he gives the impulse which he receives, like a stone that is flung and thinks it is flying, Paul, on the contrary, felt the flight of his spirit as the cast from the hand of God. In all things he has the consciousness of acting, not of his own volition, but by divine commission,—a consciousness explicable in part from his miraculous conversion, and in its keenest intensification as potent as renewed visions. In him the sense of dependence mounts to the sense of a loss of liberty; he realizes that his entire individuality is merged in identity with Christ. His faith in himself, his confidence in others, rest "in the Lord:" what he has to offer others comes to pass through the Lord, whose organ he feels himself to be. Thus when he is preferred by a congregation, he ascribes it to the fact that they easily receive the word from his mouth; and when his words strike home, he sees God's purpose of saving these hearers.[1] The alienation from God, which is the mark of this generation, is here transformed into a sense of nearness to God, of unity with God, such as only belongs to classic epochs and the genius of religious life.

Like his own life, the Apostle further finds the world about him directed to divine ends, and delights to lose himself in meditation on the purposes of God in everything.[2] Never has there been a more teleological way of regarding things. If men are fortunate enough to be children of light, it is in order that they may not be surprised by the day of Christ.[3] If they persist in the paths of unbelief, it is in order that they may perish.[4] Both are the purpose of God.

For Paul, no natural causes exist beside this absolute, divine purpose, and the Greek particle which signifies both consequence and purpose is always used by him in the sense, "in order that." So natural to him was the religious view of the world, the rela-

[1] 1 Thess. ii. 16.
[2] Ibid.
[3] 1 Thess. v. 5.
[4] Rom. i. 24; 2 Thess. ii. 11.

tion of all existence to God's scheme of salvation. He was so thoroughly dominated by the feeling that every occurrence takes place under the eye of God, and every wanderer is guided by God himself, that the word "to walk" first obtained the sense of spiritual "conduct" in his mouth, because every step is taken in the sight of God and serves divine ends. In short, if piety is the name for the quality of feeling oneself dependent upon God, and while in the present enfolded in the beyond, then there has never existed a greater genius for piety than Paul.

It is because he ascribes all that befals him or others to God's will, that he has his "Thank God!" for everything. All his Epistles begin with thanks; the more his work grows and spreads and advances, the more overwhelming is his gratitude. Since his conversion he has received a spirit of sonship, which cries aloud in him, "Abba, beloved Father!" This natural wealth of feeling it was that impelled him to use many expressions intended to proclaim the feeling that bears him along as with swelling sails,[1] the inward frankness which loosens his tongue,[2] and adequately to utter the joy within him, that heartfelt enthusiasm of early Christian days.

Dominated by this temperament, he feels himself flung onwards towards the goal which stands shining before him: "Forgetting what is behind, striving after what is before." In the ardour of his career he is unaware of the impediments which would overthrow any other. "Let us in everything commend ourselves," he cries to his beloved Corinthians,[3] "as ministers of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labours, in watchings, in fastings; in pureness, in knowledge, in long-suffering, in kindness, in the Holy Ghost, in love unfeigned, in the word of truth, in the power of God; by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, by glory and dishonour, by evil

[1] πληροφορία, πληροφορέω. Cf. his preference for compounds with ὑπέρ and derivatives of περισσός.

[2] παῤῥησία.

[3] 2 Cor. vi. 4—10.

report and good report; as deceivers, and yet true; as unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and behold, we live; as chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things." Such was the temper of life he maintained in an existence to which he might apply the words of the fourty-fourth psalm: "For thy sake are we killed all the day long; we are counted as sheep for the slaughter."

But there was another side to this energy. The impulse in Paul towards his objects was too strong for him to accept opposition calmly. Opposition stirred every fibre in him; yet not that which touched himself, but that which assailed his principle. He was made to undergo Jewish stripes, Greek scorn and Roman chains. Such treatment could stir his indignation if its brutality exceeded all bounds; but his most indignant sallies fell upon the Christian Church itself. He, who possessed a world of enemies, regarded the half-heartedness, want of principle, and narrowness of Judæo-Christianity as his sole enemy. In this struggle lies the pathos of his life; to it, all his Epistles apply directly or indirectly. It may be said that he was not always quite fair to the individuality of his adversaries. He himself was a radical by nature, who willed a thing with its logical results. He held Christianity to be a delusion; it must therefore be extirpated. He acknowledged it for truth; it must therefore be the universal religion. He therefore felt the utmost repugnance to that half-heartedness which still clung to the Jewish worship in the temple and the theocratic polity, dry boughs which could never bud again. When this party shrinks from letting Christianity stand on an independent basis, because they lack courage to take a decisive step or insight to comprehend the new, he is roused to such anger that he abuses their leaders as false Apostles, Peter and Barnabas as hypocrites, and their subordinates as dogs. Of sallies such as these, the same thing may be said as has often been said of Luther's methods; but he who wills the storm must not mind the flying spray.

Yet amid these noisy sallies of his disgust, he never lost the consciousness that the life in God is a quiet life. His expressions upon things divine show a wonderfully tender sensibility.[1] For deep in his heart dwelt the poetic genius of Israel, capable of rising to the heights of the psalm upon love (1 Cor. xiii.), and first showing us how pure and holy was the flame which caused these fiery ebullitions.

It is easy to see that the entrance of such a character into the sphere of Christian propagandism was a matter of epoch-making importance, hard as it is to obtain a comprehensive view of the Apostle's work, and apportion the results which were due to himself or his converts. Yet we gladly believe what he says of himself with legitimate assurance: "I laboured more abundantly than they all; yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me."[2]

[1] Unsurpassed in Gal. v. 5.

[2] 1 Cor. xv. 10.

Third Division.

PAUL'S SPHERE OF WORK IN THE EAST.

PAUL'S SPHERE OF WORK IN THE EAST.

1. Paul as Missionary.

Paul is universally called the Apostle of the Gentiles, and himself speaks of his Apostolate to the uncircumcised. But it is not to be understood from this that he started his missionary career with the intention of converting the Gentiles. The idea is contradicted by his whole practice. To convert Gentiles, he need not have left Tarsus and Antioch for Cyprus, nor climbed the Taurus to the heart of Asia Minor. There were Gentiles enough in Syria and Cilicia; so that when the Apostle turns his back on the Gentiles in his native town and seeks out Cyprus, which suffered from no dearth of Jews,—when everywhere in Asia Minor he settles down where there are Jewish communities, and, after reaching Europe, simply passes through the manufacturing town of Neapolis to visit the far less important Philippi with its community of Jews,—the object of these journeys was to bring tidings of the Messiah and the reconciliation given in Jesus to his fellow-countrymen abroad, not to introduce a mission to the Gentiles.

From this point of view the Apostle's life of wandering is thoroughly comprehensible. But a little time was left before the return of the Messiah; the more the Jews of Palestine hardened their hearts against the tidings of his coming, the more imperious the necessity for the Apostle to give his countrymen abroad news of what had happened meanwhile in the Holy Land. This is the idea with which Paul, in Rom. x., lays it down as the

duty of the churches to send out preachers to the Dispersion. In this passage he examines the question whether Israel had not already been instructed sufficiently concerning the appearance of the Messiah and the conditions of salvation,[1] and points out that it was a matter of duty to send out preachers of the faith, for "how shall they believe in him whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent?"

In his own case, this sense of the duty of missionary work was heightened by the impossibility of attaching any adequate meaning to the vision of the divine man vouchsafed to him near Damascus, save of his own appointment to the duty of preaching the approaching advent. From that day forward it is one of the fundamental facts in Paul's consciousness that he had been separated "even from his mother's womb, and called through God's grace to preach the gospel among the Gentiles,"[2] for he can give no other interpretation of the peculiar grace he had met with. Thenceforward, therefore, his thought is concentrated on one point, that at last, upon the day of Jesus' return, it may be permitted him to lead before the Messiah an imposing number of churches, which shall then be his "joy," his "glory," his "crown of glory," on the day of the saints.[3] He wishes to present the church as the bride to the coming bridegroom, and therefore "is jealous over every single church with a godly jealousy."[4] Now this jealousy is the irresistible voice of the spirit within him. "For if I preach the gospel," he says, "I have nothing to glory of; for necessity is laid upon me; for woe is unto me if I preach not the gospel."[5] It is a fundamental principle of his spiritual life that he is "called to be an Apostle through the will of God;"[6]

[1] Rom. x. 18.

[2] Gal. i. 15. For the notion of the ἔθνη in Paul, cf. Mangold, Epist. Rom. 76, seq.

[3] 2 Cor. xi. 2; 1 Thess. ii. 19; 2 Thess. i. 7; Phil. ii. 16; Col. i. 28.

[4] 2 Cor. xi. 2. [5] 1 Cor. ix. 16. [6] 1 Cor. i. 1, &c.

that his missionary life is a divine necessity, a task laid upon him from above; that he is Christ's bondman, his steward, his prisoner, led in triumph over the world.

Corresponding to this life-long task laid upon him, God has chosen for him a gift peculiarly serviceable to his calling, from amongst all the gifts of grace which the spirit is wont to bestow on the regenerate as a token from the higher world and pledge and earnest of future spiritual life. In 1 Cor. iii. 10, the Apostle calls it his own special grace that he is peculiarly empowered to found churches. His vocation is to be a pioneer, to make the first clearing where the sound of the axe has never before been heard.

It testifies to true self-knowledge that Paul calls this specially his gift of grace, for in reality he possesses all the qualities suited to overcoming initial resistance. First among these comes his gift of eloquence. Of course we meet with the strange reproach of his adversaries, recorded by Paul himself: "His letters, they say, are weighty and strong; but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech of no account."[1] In a certain sense this may perhaps be true. All aids from without were denied to the man of Tarsus. He complains bitterly, more than once, that he was spiritually checked by bodily influences and failed to reach the fulness of his spiritual powers.[2] Yet he might still testify of himself: "The weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh, but mighty before God to the casting down of strongholds; casting down imaginations, and every high thing that is exalted against the knowledge of God, and bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ; and being in readiness to avenge all disobedience, when your obedience shall be fulfilled."[3] How could the writer of 1 Cor. xiii. and Rom. ix. not be an orator? How could the words that for ages since have appealed to millions fail to carry away those who heard them for the first time face to face, in the actual circumstances which engendered them? The devout words of the orator born

[1] 2 Cor. x. 10. [2] Gal. iv. 13; 1 Cor. ii. 3. [3] 2 Cor x. 4, seq.

of the feeling of the moment must have touched and moved the auditors then far more than to-day, whether he makes the humble confession to the church: "Not as though I had already attained, but I follow after;" or thankfully avows to Heaven: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God!" or cries in a burst of enthusiasm: "O death, where is thy sting! O grave, where is thy victory?" Paul perhaps often experienced in his own person what he predicted of the true prophets, that if they speak rightly to the unbeliever, "he is reproved, he is judged; the secrets of his heart are made manifest; and so he will fall down on his face and worship God, declaring that God is among you indeed."[1] Still, so much of his adversaries' taunts is true, that he would not make conversion to Christ a result of rhetoric, like other itinerant preachers. For him, faith in Christ was an operation of the spirit. He therefore leaves everything to the spirit; as, for example, he is conscious that both matter and form of his address are given him by the spirit, and are not "words which man's wisdom teacheth."[2] His own contribution consists only in an educational choice of material, for he keeps back "mysteries" from the multitude, and feeds those who are still weak upon "milk"[3] alone.

We must therefore look for his gift of "laying foundations" not so much in his oratory as his personality. The whole man was an Apostle. To produce strong effects on others depends above all on that unity with self which belonged to Paul. A character possessed, like his, with its idea, is far more convincing than any amount of words. He has the further qualities of quick initiative, rapid knowledge of men, capacity to mould himself into every possible form, to be a Jew in a Jewish house, in a Gentile house a Gentile, while setting himself graciously on a level with the weak,—qualities eminently necessary to the task of "founding."[4] He is neither fastidious nor diffident.

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 24, seq.
[2] 1 Cor. ii. 13.
[3] 1 Cor. iii. 1, xv. 51.
[4] 1 Cor. ix. 20, iii. 21.

He descends into thieves' dens;[1] he is the welcome friend of the slave-rooms;[2] but at the same time he knows how to make himself respected by free citizens,[3] and is not abashed before the purple stripe on the toga.[4]

But he is pre-eminently and irresistibly dominated by the impulse of travel which betokens the true missionary nature. It is "ever onward" with such a temper. He has something of the insatiability of the great conqueror, whose hunger for new territories is whetted as with demonic power by every fresh conquest. As Jesus' leading trait is the shepherd's feeling, so Paul's is the missionary impulse. Everywhere he is only on the way: he has but one thought—to make the word speed on swiftly; while his eagerness for travel only grows with time. He scales the snowy heights of Taurus, whence he is drawn to the valleys of Lycaonia. He travels on to the Ægean, where in a vision a man of Macedon appears to him and cries: "Come over and help us!" He comes to Corinth, where ships sail to Italy; and straightway he writes to Rome, as always in his prayers making request, "if by any means now at length he may be prospered by the will of God to come unto them."[5] Voices across the sea call to him, "Come;" in hours of solitude he thinks of those "who have not heard." This cry of "ever onwards" is the special watchword of his life. He is led and borne everywhere by the prophetic word: "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace, that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation, that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth."[6] These words of Isaiah led him on his journeyings. Many a time he looks back with pride upon the distance he has come,[7] and boasts that the triumphal procession in which Christ leads him through the streets of the world leaves behind it the savour of his knowledge in every place like incense.[8]

[1] 1 Cor. vi. 9, seq. [2] 1 Cor. i. 11. [3] Rom. xvi. 21, seq.
[4] Acts xxvi. 27. [5] Rom. i. 9, seq. [6] Rom. x. 15, after Is. lii. 7, seq.
[7] Rom. xv. 19; 2 Cor. x. 14, 16. [8] 2 Cor. ii. 15.

This was the poetry of his life, the sweet savour in his mouth. He had felt it in the blessedness of the Galatians, in the election of the Macedonians, in the Corinthians, who are his legible attestation that he has not had the grace of God in vain. "My grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weakness,"—such were the words uttered by his inward voice when he was struck down by his infirmity.[1] The same voice enables him to bear all shame and contumely; it gives him courage to return again and again as often as he is cast out. He says openly what Tacitus adduces as the shame of the Christians, that he is the filth and offscouring of every city, everywhere cast out by men. He acknowledges to the ambitious Corinthians in what his honour consists: "Even unto this present hour we both hunger and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling-place; and labour, working with our own hands. Being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it; being defamed, we entreat. We are made as the filth of the world, and are the offscouring of all things unto this day."[2]

This restlessness of conquest is accompanied by tenacity of purpose. He did not lose one of the churches which he founded or which committed themselves to his care. Here, again, his resources are inexhaustible. Never was there a more consummate master in the art of ruling souls. If he thinks exhortation necessary for his churches, he applies the spur at once, adding, "as ye also do." If he has to praise, he praises freely—"all without exception." He shows an almost maternal feeling in speaking of his churches. So he describes it himself;[3] while at another time he turns a father's earnest gaze upon the development of his creations. He can speak with the most flattering delicacy; yet can thunder in awe-striking passion; and himself asks the churches if he shall come with the "spirit of meekness" or with the "rod."[4]

[1] 2 Cor. xii. 9.
[2] 1 Cor. iv. 11, seq.
[3] 1 Thess. ii. 7.
[4] 1 Cor. iv. 21.

Again, in his boundless love he can even discern goodness where we, with the best will in the world, fail to see anything of the kind; yet he never tampers with the truth, as can be clearly seen by comparing the unrestrained tone in which he thanks God for every perfection of the sturdy Macedonians, with the measured expressions in which he gives thanks for the wealth of gifts and knowledge which God has bestowed upon the Corinthians. Where a spark still glimmers, he knows how to fan it into flame; but if necessary, he disregards all amenities. He can ruthlessly shatter a sinner's personal honour, and crush his good name under foot; yet can cleverly appeal to ambition,[1] and on occasion enlist worldly selfishness in his own interests; as, for example, he did not think it beneath him to turn to the metropolitan feeling of the cities, and fire them with the desire of increasing "your and our cities."[2]

Such power over whole communities can only be explained by the intimate relations Paul had already established with individuals. He never confined himself to speaking in the synagogue, but was indefatigable in searching out the most personal needs of each individual soul. As a father his children, he took each to task; exhorted the indolent and neglectful; vigorously stirred up the self-sufficient, who rocked themselves in security; and compelled the lascivious, who were in bondage to sin, to swear to walk in a way worthy of the God who has called them all, and thus to attain to the enjoyment of the Messianic glory.[3]

His adversaries give an invidious name to this marvellous capacity of enmeshing families and churches with fine but firm threads, calling it readiness "to persuade men," or "please men."[4] Paul has to defend himself repeatedly against the charge of cajoling men with flattery and entrapping the churches with his wiles for his own ends.[5] These must have been Jewish

[1] 1 Cor. vi. 6. [2] 1 Cor. i. 13. [3] 1 Thess. ii. 11, seq. [4] Gal. i. 10.

[5] 2 Cor. xii. 16; 1 Thess. ii. 5, seq. In fact, several expressions, familiar enough to the Oriental, might seem strange to the Greek. Compare such

forms of humility he adopted when reproached with flattery at Thessalonica; when he triumphantly asks the Galatians after a vigorous anathema: "Am I now persuading men? or am I seeking to please men?"[1] or again, when he begins a letter to the Corinthians with these words: "I, Paul, who in your presence am lowly among you, but being absent am of good courage toward you; yea, I beseech you, that I may not when present show courage with the confidence wherewith I count to be bold against some, which count of us as if we walked according to the flesh."[2] Those especially who were at a distance were often unable to conceive that behind this self-renouncing readiness of service and humility, this feverish activity, there did not lurk a motive equally crude, such as ambition, imperiousness, pleasure, or, at best, sentimentality.[3]

It became one of his principles, in order to avoid anything like a false position, never to demand support from the churches, but to live by the work of his own hands. By thus "making the gospel without charge," he avoided possible misinterpretation of his action in the future, while making the churches more accessible to the poor.[4] Yet the necessity of earning his own bread was a great impediment to the expansion of his powers, for in all his letters he reiterates that he indeed brings a sacrifice; that he feels it, moreover, as such, and is greatly straitened by it.[5]

Under existing circumstances, this was the only prudent course; for as in Palestine the Christians had soon withdrawn from the courts of the temple and synagogues to remote byways and private houses, so in the Dispersion foreign evangelists were very soon compelled to seek occupation outside the house of

passages as 1 Thess. ii. 19; Phil. iv. 1. Similarly, Phil. iv. 18, where Paul calls the money-offering of the Philippians "an odour of sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God."

[1] Gal. i. 10. [2] 2 Cor. x. 1, seq. [3] 1 Thess. ii. 3—10.

[4] 1 Cor. ix. 18; 2 Thess. iii. 8.

[5] 1 Cor. iv. 12, ix. 6—20; 2 Cor. xii. 13; 1 Thess. i. 9, &c.

God. This commended itself more to resident workers than to itinerant preachers without a trade; so we hear that not only Paul, but also his colleague Barnabas, used to look about for work immediately in whatever place he proposed to begin his ministrations.[1] The next move, according to the eye-witness in Acts xvi. 13, was to the place of prayer or the synagogue, in order to employ the customary freedom of speech in publishing the tidings that Christ had appeared, and had died, according to the Scriptures, in order to establish a reconciliation between man and God. "Now, then, we are ambassadors for Christ," says Paul himself, "as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you, in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God."[2]

The gist and manner of his speeches on this, the common theme of all his addresses, may be exemplified by the style and matter of the Epistle to the Romans. For this Epistle is avowedly written to a church which is unknown to Paul, and listens to his words for the first time. So it would be but natural to suppose that Paul here writes very much what he elsewhere speaks to those whom he first approached with his tidings. Other facts point to the substance of the Epistle to the Romans being practically the substance of his oral preaching elsewhere. Almost identical thoughts, though more briefly expressed, appear in the Epistle to the Galatians; above all, there are many passages in his other Epistles in which the Apostle presupposes as known what is here developed in detail. If we did not possess the Epistle to the Romans, it would be absolutely impossible to understand passages like Gal. ii. 15—21, about Paul's speech to Peter concerning justification, or 1 Cor. xv., of the two-fold Adam. The Galatians and Corinthians would have found them equally unintelligible unless the Apostle had already preached to them precisely what we must first read in Romans if we wish to understand the meaning of the writer. So it is a most probable inference that what we read in the Epistle to the

[1] 1 Cor. ix. 6.

[2] 2 Cor. v. 20, seq.

Romans was, speaking generally, the essential substance of the Pauline preaching.

We may also consider the agreement of the two as fairly complete. An itinerant preacher, like the Apostle, who continually proclaimed the tidings of the Messiah's appearance to new synagogues and new churches, could not fail gradually to stereotype his material. An orator could not fail to find one particular order in his discourse the most effectual, and this he would keep to. Thus a scheme of preaching shaped itself, so to say; and this scheme Paul doubtless reproduced most completely when, as was the case with the Romans, he could not preach in person, but only with the pen and by dictation. Whoever, then, wishes to know what Paul preached in the synagogues of the Jewish Dispersion, must not trust to the speeches in the Acts, but to the Epistle to the Romans, for the former were composed by an historian of the following century after the ancient manner of writing history.

Entering a synagogue for the first time, Paul could not possibly begin his address better than in the majestic style which marks the introduction to his writings. As suited the serious and threatening aspect of the times, and the general foreboding of great judgments to come, Paul speaks of the wrath of God visibly appearing upon the whole Gentile world. He speaks of the insane errors of idolatry; the sins which spread ever more shameless and unnatural. He repeats against the Gentile world all those words of condemnation which the Jews had uttered times without number in their religious writings of the period, and which were well known to all Jews of the Dispersion through the Sibyl, the Apocrypha and pseudonymous religious pamphlets.

But his speech immediately changes its course. The Jews, for all their revelation, their law, their promise, their covenant with God, were no whit behind the Gentiles in sin. They are sinners one and all, lacking the glory of God; for it is not given to flesh to attain a state of justification before God.

Now this view of things so patent leads the Apostle on to the question, how man can be justified before God, how the law is unable to alter the flesh, how a regeneration through the Messiah was needful, and how this regeneration was fulfilled in the death of the Messiah. Of course, Paul had no need to introduce to the Roman Christians all the questions of the Christology which needed discussion before unconverted Jews, although, in addressing himself to unconverted hearers in the synagogue, he would have practically relied upon the proof brought forward in the Epistle to the Romans, namely, that the kingdom is attainable by human conditions produced, not through the law, but through the regeneration of man in a new Adam.

The dualistic principles of his theology thus propounded supplied the connection with the universal consciousness of the period; while, on the other hand, the polemic against the law easily explains the fate of this preaching, rejected by the law-regarding Jews as blasphemy, only to be the more eagerly embraced by the proselytes who had been led to the synagogue by a religious want. The result soon appeared everywhere in separation. Those who did not accept the law as a means of salvation, and withal taught a crucified Messiah, could not long be tolerated in the bosom of the synagogue. When they now established churches of their own, the Gentiles predominated among them from the outset, and, conversely, the connections and acquaintance of the earliest converts were naturally among the Gentiles.

In the earliest period, of course, Paul appears to have incorporated Gentile Christians such as these into the body of Judaism. In Galatia, at all events, he is reproached with circumcising the Gentiles elsewhere. His answer is, not that the charge is false, but (Gal. v. 11), "If I still preach circumcision, why am I still persecuted?" This expression seems to prove that Paul began by preaching circumcision. In itself it would neither be inconceivable, nor in any way a reproach to Paul, that in his earliest

period he approximated to the practice of the Palestinian Christians. Though it is certain that he could not have circumcised Timothy, as is asserted by the Acts, at the time when he wrote the Epistle to the Galatians, it is still questionable whether the story was simply invented by the writer of the Acts, or whether he was not acquainted with the reproach of double-dealing levelled against his hero, and therefore proposes to show, by the case of Timothy, in what instances Paul indeed applied circumcision, viz. to the children of mixed marriages. Further, Paul signifies expressly in Gal. ii. that he made circumcision a question of principle precisely because false brethren who had crept in wished to make it a condition of salvation.[1]

Thus Paul's gifts of winning and keeping men first declared themselves fully in the little circle thus gathered together. He himself bears witness[2] that he organized these churches exactly like those of all other saints, and so it only remains to follow him into particulars as far as the state of our authorities permits.

---

2. The Period in Antioch.

We learn from Paul's own account of his life in Gal. i. 21, that after his departure from Jerusalem in 39, he laboured first in Syria, then in his native Cilicia. The commencement of his Syrian work, therefore, falls in the later years of Caligula. While the emperor feasted in Lugdunum, returning to Rome in August, 40, to celebrate his victories over the Germans and Britons, the struggle for synagogue and temple was raging in Egypt and Palestine, and its disturbing influences were felt in Antioch. Amid these disturbances Paul nevertheless

[1] Cf. also Rom. xiv. 1—7. The common interpretation of 2 Cor. v. 16 also points to a development of his preaching, but we do not admit its correctness.

[2] 1 Cor. xi. 16, xiv. 36.

obtained such striking results in his missionary work, that even Jerusalem turned its attention to him as a leader in the cause of Jesus. The churches in Judæa, unacquainted with him personally, heard of his successful labours, "and they glorified God in me," as Paul himself testifies in the Epistle to the Galatians.

This mission, which attracted so wide attention, had a noticeable result in the foundation of a Cilician church. Its centre is naturally to be looked for in the Jewish quarter of Tarsus, and mention is repeatedly made of it in the Acts.[1] It is only to be remarked that while Paul, in Gal. i. 21, says he worked in Syria and Cilicia, the Acts transpose the scenes of his labours and make Paul go to Antioch after Tarsus. Notwithstanding this contradiction, it remains indubitable that Paul was respected in Antioch;[2] while according to Acts xiii., this was the church from which, at the beginning of Claudius' reign, Paul, Barnabas and John Mark were sent out to preach the coming of the Messiah in Cyprus, Pamphylia and Galatia.

It is indeed questionable whether Paul set out with an express authorization from the church of Antioch. The Acts would gladly see him in this position, but he himself deprecates it most decidedly in Gal. i. 12. Moreover, his protest is particularly directed against those churches which, according to the Acts, were converted by him in this very period. Yet so much at least is indubitable from Gal. ii. 11, that there was an original connection between the parent church of Antioch and those which grew up in Cyprus, Pamphylia and Galatia, the former claiming a position of authority as the parent church. Like other matters, the scheme of Paul's mission, as presented by the writer of the Acts, cannot be accepted without further support.

The preaching of the kingdom in Galilee once consisted in passing from village to village, and from town to town, conformably with the publicity of life in the East common to the little

[1] Acts xv. 23, 41.

[2] Gal. ii. 11, seq.

circle to which the preaching was then confined. The disciples preached that the kingdom was close at hand, and after fulfilling this task set out on their way again. Now Paul's missionary work had as a rule not the slightest resemblance to this mode of procedure. His missions were anything but preaching in one place after another, anything but what could be spoken of as "preaching through" a particular country. The Apostle took up a trade, settled down, made the acquaintance of his fellow-countrymen, and became intimate with individual families. Thus he converts souls one by one and from the deepest foundations; he made life-long alliances. Now no reason can be conceived why Paul should have given up this method of his, as known from his letters, in those particular cases where we do not possess letters. Moreover, according to the Apostle's own account, fourteen years are spent in the work of Syria, Cilicia and the districts of the so-called first missionary journey.[1] For this reason, too, we ought to allow longer periods for the stay in each district. For the rest, the scanty information we possess for such long periods is entirely insufficient to give a clear picture of the Apostle's work.

First mentioned is CYPRUS, which stood in close relation to Antioch and the Jews there. It was the home of Mnason, one of the elder disciples; Barnabas himself was a Cypriot, and among the founders of the church of Antioch some perhaps were natives of Cyprus. But we have no further details as to the nature of the connection and the mission to the island. The stories current in the second century of a conflict between the Apostle and the sorcerer Elymas at Paphos, is easily recognizable as a patchwork of the little which the ordinary man, even at Rome, knew of Cyprus. This little was that Cyprus was a senatorial province, which therefore fell vacant every year, and had a proconsul chosen by the senate. One of these may have been the Roman scholar Sergius Paulus, quoted twenty years later by the elder Pliny as an authority for the condition

[1] Gal. ii. 1.

of Cyprus and other facts of physical geography.[1] Hence, perhaps, the Cyprian proconsul of this name in the Acts.

The seat of government was the western city of the island facing Rome, where news first came from the capital—Paphos, famed of old, where the Paphian goddess dispensed her coveted oracles, a goddess to whose voice the Flavian Titus did not disdain to listen at a critical moment.[2] Most famous of all, however, was the school of divination at Paphos, inheritors of secret lore, but notorious for their slippery arts.[3]

Thus Paphos was known at Rome as the seat of a proconsul, and a place where oracles, priestly disorder and sorcery, were at their height. In particular, Pliny connects the sorcery of Cyprus with the Jewish sorcerers, Moses, Jamnes and Jotapes (Jambres and Mambres, Exod. vii. 11; 2 Tim. iii. 8), according to which the origin of this school of superstition must have been due to Jewish cabbalists. Here, then, were all the elements of the story in which the Acts bring together Paul the proconsul and Paul the Apostle, and even derive from it the Greek name of Paul.[4] Yet even did such an encounter take place over the actual foundation of the church in Cyprus, no light is thrown on it by this isolated account. Moreover, the honoured follower of the Apostle disappears entirely from history. As a matter of fact, the successes of the "son of consolation" in the land of his youth and kindred, may be put down as less considerable. For it is directly probable that BARNABAS must here take the first place, because he was at home in the island. The same conclusion may be drawn from the fact that in the year 53, when the breach occurred between him and Paul, he takes Cyprus as his sphere of work, while Paul goes away to Asia

[1] Pliny cites one Sergius Paulus in the index of authorities at the beginning of Books ii. and xviii., in which books he touches upon the geological condition of Cyprus, ii. 90; the length of the journeys across Cyprus, ii. 11, 2, 2; the position of the constellations over Cyprus, xviii. 57, 6; the nature of Cyprian wheat, xviii. 12, 4, which makes the identity of the Sergius Paulus of the Acts with the natural philosopher very doubtful indeed.

[2] Tac. Hist. v. 3. [3] Ibid.; Plin. xxx. 2, 6. [4] Acts xiii. 5—12.

Minor, never to set foot again in Cyprus, however often his journeys brought him near.

We know as little of the length of his stay in Cyprus as of its results. One thing alone is clear. When the three Christians from Antioch proposed to leave the island, they had to consider the choice of a new district which had not been reached by the tidings of the coming of the Messiah. So they crossed over to Pamphylia, which was to open the way to fields as yet untried.

PAMPHYLIA was the name given to the southern slopes of Taurus west of Cilicia, a narrow strip along the coast between the mountain land of Pisidia and the Mediterranean. The chief cities of this district were ATTALIA and PERGA, one on the seashore, at the mouth of the rapid Catarrhactes; the other, sixty stades above the mouth of the broad Cestrus, navigable for massive rafts and stately ships. The valley of the Cestrus and the ravine of the Catarrhactes formed the only passes from this coast to the highlands of Pisidia and Lycaonia. Both were traversed by roads, descending from the mountains to Perga and Attalia on the Mediterranean, along which enterprizing merchants, some of them Jews, brought down to the coast the varied products of the interior—wood, lumber, oil, resin, styrax, orris-root, peltry, wool and goats'-hair from Angora. This carrying trade found better security in arrangements with the neighbouring chieftains than in Claudius' fortresses. Although Attalia lay nearer the sea, Perga was the more important centre of trade, for the Cestrus, together with a number of inland lakes, formed a natural canal stretching far towards Pisidia and opening a proportionately favourable passage to the interior. Perga, moreover, was a sacred city of Diana, and thus had a hierarchical importance like Ephesus.[1]

Inland from Perga begins a labyrinth of valleys, plateaus and mountain ranges, so notorious that Strabo, even in the time of Tiberius, has to confess that the tribes scattered over these

[1] Strabo, xiv. 983.

inaccessible ravines and valleys, could not be considered as all fairly subjugated.[1] Inhabited by savage and courageous mountaineers—Selgenses, Homonadaeans, Isaurians and Clitæ, who mocked the legions from their fortalices—this district was a sort of Roman Caucasus, which maintained unceasing war.[2] Indeed, there was no other district of Asia Minor remaining in such a state of unmitigated barbarism. The very first condition of culture was lacking, namely, the Greek tongue, for the tribes clung tenaciously to their old dialects.[3] After the descriptions of the locality given by Cicero and Strabo, not only can we understand how, at Perga, John Mark "departed from" Paul and Barnabas and "returned to Jerusalem,"[4] but when Paul declares that as the servant of Christ he had been proved "in perils of rivers, in perils of robbers, in perils from Jews, in perils from the Gentiles, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness,"[5] we are tempted to think of this journey. But the more venturesome it seems to set out upon a road only taken by caravans of merchants, the more urgent is the question why Paul and Barnabas chose this part of the Taurus of all places for the scene of their operations, when land routes and sea routes lay open to them, cities and provinces of every kind, offering a greater future than these hidden dales in the wilds of Taurus. Clearly their object was to find synagogues so remote that they had not yet taken sides nor been filled with prejudice; so far from home that a traveller who had seen the Holy City and the Jews of the Mediterranean, could not fail to be received in them with open arms. Such pre-eminently were the members of their own faith settled in the lonely provinces north of the Taurus, who had ventured so far afield in the hope of wealth and in confidence of protection from the Roman colonies. In addition, Paul, who had worked in Cilicia before, hardly found

[1] Geogr. xii. 6, 7 (p. 852, seq.), xiv. 3 (p. 970, seq.).

[2] Cicero, Ad Att. vii. 5, 11, 18; Plin. v. 23; Tac. Ann. iii. 48, vi. 41, xii. 55; Dio Cass. lx. 17.

[3] Acts xiv. 11. [4] Acts xiii. 13. [5] 2 Cor. xi. 26.

these inaccessible mountain regions so terrible as did Mark, the native of Jerusalem. Active intercourse was maintained between Tarsus and Iconium; while the Jews of Lycaonia were undoubtedly an offshoot from the Jews of Tarsus. The latter place, indeed, had grown rich by trading in the products of the province lying inland from it. So Paul might well have connections with these places, and as Barnabas had taken him to Cyprus, so now he took Barnabas with him to Galatia.

---

3. Foundation of Churches in Galatia.[1]

We are more favoured in our information about the foundation of the church in the Roman province of Galatia than about Cyprus and Pamphylia, inasmuch as an overwhelming probability avouches that the Epistle to the Galatians was addressed to the Christians of Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe, cities which at that time all belonged to the province of Galatia.[2]

[1] For the ethnography and geography, see "The Apostle Paul," 2nd ed. 1872, p. 216.

[2] The scantier the documents for the earliest days of Christianity, the more important is the question, what are the circumstances, persons and places, to which they refer? So it is of the utmost importance to decide where we are to look for the Christians to whom the so-called Epistle to the Galatians was addressed. Galatia originally meant no more than the province in the north of Asia Minor between Greater Phrygia and Pontus, on either side of the Halys, where the Trocmi, Tlistoboii and Tectosages had settled in 240 B.C. After the Roman division into provinces, on the other hand, the province of Galatia included all districts between the Taurus and Bithynia; Upper Pisidia, therefore, Upper Phrygia and Lycaonia, together with Galatia proper on the Halys; so that excepting Perga, all the places visited on the first missionary journey lie within the limits of the province of Galatia. One question remains: Could Paul call the inhabitants of these districts Galatians? Properly they were not so, for, strictly speaking, only the Kelts of the "Galaticus" could lay claim to the name. But as the Lycaonians, Pisidians and Greater Phrygians had come under the Galatian government ever since the time of the first triumvirate, Paul might well call them so, especially as his custom is to keep accurately to the official

We therefore possess two authorities for this creation of the Apostle's, Acts xiii. and xiv. and the Epistle to the Galatians.

names of tribes and places in the empire. Indeed, he everywhere makes exclusive use of the Roman names of provinces, never the names of the districts. When, in 1 Thess. ii. 14, he speaks of the churches in Judæa, he does not mean the Jewish district of this name, but the administrative district so named by the Romans, including Galilee, Samaria and Peræa. When, in Gal. i. 21, he speaks of his sojourn in Antioch and Tarsus, he calls the provinces Syria and Cilicia; when he speaks of his flight into Hauran, he says: "I went to Arabia." In 1 Thess. i. 7, and 2 Cor. ix. 2, xi. 10, speaking of the churches of Philippi, Thessalonica, Berœa and Corinth, he uses the Roman divisions of Macedonia and Achaia. Similarly in 2 Cor. i., relating his sufferings in Ephesus, he speaks of the great persecution he underwent in Asia. In 1 Cor. xvi. 1, Galatia is again mentioned, for there the collection he recommended to the Corinthians from Ephesus is already in progress. Here, too, it is quite probable that he had the neighbouring towns of Antioch, Iconium, &c., in view, and not the distant "Galaticus." In short, then, Paul nowhere employs the local names of districts, but always the provincial names. While Judæa, Syria, Cilicia, Asia, Macedonia, Achaia, are with him in every case the names of Roman provinces, there is no ground for taking Galatia in its turn to mean anything but the Roman province of that name. Moreover, the Apostle's use of these terms is supported by that of the New Testament. The First Epistle of Peter, written by a follower of Paul in the time of Trajan, is addressed at the outset to the Christian Dispersion of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia. Here there is no need to ask whether the province is denoted by Galatia; it is shown by the accompanying names of provinces. Therefore other New Testament authors understand by Galatia the province of that name, and 1 Peter i. 1 indubitably refers to none other than the flourishing cities of Derbe, Lystra and Iconium, for we know nothing of other churches. The Acts are a book that cannot be appealed to in support of the assumption that the Galatians of Paul's Epistle are to be looked for in the Γαλατικὴ χώρα on the Halys, for it either expressly denies that churches were founded there (xvi. 6), or at all events knows of none. Granted, however, that Paul founded the Galatian churches on the journey through Galatia mentioned in xvi. 6, his renewed visit to the Galatians would fall in the year 56 (xviii. 23), and the Epistle to the Galatians could only date from this year. But in the year 56, Paul, according to xviii. 22, had already been three times to Jerusalem, while he wrote the Epistle to the Galatians, according to the express assurance given in it, when he had only visited Jerusalem twice since his conversion. Any one, therefore, who refers the Epistle to the Galatians to the Γαλατικὴ χώρα, must strike out the journey to Jerusalem related in Acts xviii. 23, because the Epistle to the Galatians knows

Both Pamphylia and Galatia had been formed into a province

nothing of it. But it is purely arbitrary to transfer the foundation of the churches to Acts xvi. 6, when nothing is said of it in the Acts, and then to do away with a journey to Jerusalem expressly related in xviii. 23. We are rather compelled to refer the Epistle to the Galatians to the churches founded on the first missionary journey. For it is only thus that Paul can have visited them a second time before going to Jerusalem the third time. A similar chronological reason is to be deduced from Gal. ii. 5. At the time of the struggle about circumcision before the second missionary journey, the Galatian churches are already in existence, for Paul did not yield for a moment to the Pharisaic Christians ἵνα ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διαμείνῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς. But as for the "Galaticus," Paul only visited it after the struggle in Jerusalem. Again, internal reasons also make it probable that the Galatian churches were foundations of the first missionary journey. The substance of the Epistle to the Galatians itself points decidedly to the churches of the province of Galatia, which Paul visited on the first missionary journey so called. The whole theme of the Epistle turns upon the quarrel which had broken out with regard to the Gentiles converted by Paul and Barnabas on the first missionary journey. This first journey, however, only took them into the south of the province of Galatia, not into the district of that name. Further, the Epistle presupposes the acquaintance of those to whom it is addressed with Barnabas, for in ii. 13, the Apostle tells his readers how it comes about that he has quarrelled with Barnabas. Now the journey through the district of Galatia (Acts xvi. 6) did not take place till after Barnabas' separation from Paul, while both had worked together in southern Galatia. These supposed Christians in the ταλ. χώρα would therefore have had no acquaintance whatever with Barnabas, and no reason is apparent for Paul, then, to tell them that even Barnabas had been carried away by the dissimulation of the Jewish Christians. It is also a very improbable supposition that certain churches in the *Galaticus*, beyond the Asiatic highlands, should have been in such active intercourse with Antioch and Jerusalem as is presupposed by the Epistle to the Galatians, whereas intercourse between the cities of Lycaonia and the two centres of Christianity by the trade routes from Attalia and Perga is much easier to explain. Finally, it is not in itself expedient to make a merely unknown quantity the recipient of a document so important as the Epistle to the Galatians, which singles out those to whom it is addressed as the object of attack by the whole church. Churches which provoked such a quarrel could not slip from the recollection of the Church in such a way as to leave absolutely no memory of their existence, which would have been the case with the unknown churches in the *Galaticus*. In conclusion, we must adopt the view advanced by Niemeyer, Paulus, Böttger, Mynster, Thiersch, and of late most forcibly by Renan, that our Epistle to the Galatians was an encyclical to the Christians of the

in the year 25.[1] We know little of their fortunes in the time of Tiberius; yet Strabo and Tacitus draw a gloomy picture of the state of things then in the Taurus, and in the last year of the emperor the proconsul of Syria, Vitellius, was once more compelled to send an army against the Clitæ, in the neighbourhood of Derbe.[2] The war continued under Claudius. L. Pupius Præsens, the procurator of the province, is called the second founder of Iconium in an inscription of that town, which, moreover, now assumed the name of Claudia or Claudiconium.[3] Lystra and Derbe, too, are mentioned by Pliny and Ptolemy as places of note. At the time when Paul and Barnabas directed their steps thither, the administration of the procurator named above still continued.[4] As a whole, this district was still but little Hellenized.

"The Galatians considered days and moons and seasons and years to be in bondage to the elements of the world;" they served those primæval Phrygian deities whose sanctuaries were at Antioch, Pessinus and Iconium; Lunus-Attes (Sabazius), i.e. the changing disc of the moon, and Rhea Cybele, goddess of the cycle of life in nature.[5] These divinities were celebrated together, and their principal feast took place in the spring, a mad piece of nature-worship, in which the clash of cymbals and kettle-drums, pipes and horns, accompanied the wild dance of the mutilated priests. On several occasions in the year, wild troops of Gauls rushed over hill and dale, filling hamlet and town with wild riot and holy *ululatus*. So it is easy to understand what the Apostle means when he calls the keeping of the Jewish new moons and festivals, learnt afterwards from the Jews by

churches at Derbe, Lystra, Iconium and Antioch, whose admission to the Christian communion without circumcision occasioned the whole quarrel in which those of Jerusalem were resisted by Paul shortly after his first journey, and their partizans routed by the Galatian Christians.

[1] Dio Cass. liii. 26, liv. 34.

[2] Tac. Ann. vi. 41.

[3] Cf. Renan, Paul, p. 92.

[4] Corp. Inscr. Gr. 4037.

[5] Plut. De Isid. et Os. 69.

the Galatians, a backsliding into their former worship. And as for Paul advising the most eager Judaists not to associate only with the circumcised, but rather with those who mutilate themselves, it is not a questionable play upon words,[1] but rather a reference to the hosts of eunuchs who gathered round the temple at Antioch, and sought to secure divine favour on the same principle as the friends of circumcision.

Generally speaking, the religious peculiarities and well-known characteristics of the tribes of Asia Minor are reflected in the Epistle addressed by Paul to his Galatian converts to Christianity. The first impression it leaves is, that Paul had Oriental conditions in view when distinguishing between the inheritance of Sarah's son and Hagar's, or addressing the Christians of Galatia on the principle that so long as the heir is under age, there is no difference between him and a slave. Analogies of this sort are only true for Asia, the land of polygamy and arbitrary sultans,[2] where there were endless quarrels between the sons of the wife and of the concubines; where princes are slaves until the time appointed by their father, and the inheritance of the daughters is so scanty that it was really true to say: "If we are sons, then heirs."

The moral delinquencies, too, which Paul believes he must combat in his encyclical, call up a generation far different from the intelligent sons of Achaia or the froward race whose home was Macedonia. Twice he speaks of magic arts, which had a great fascination for this superstitious people, whether consisting of mysterious spells and invocations, or strange and superstitious cures, or in the use of idolatrous amulets.[3] Nor did the Apostle fail to note wherein lay the greatest danger for Christianity among these churches. It is the overpowering sensuality of

[1] Gal. v. 12.

[2] Especially for the Galatians, as is shown by the remark of Gaius (Institut. Comment. i. § 55): "Nec me præterit, Galatarum gentem credere, in potestate parentum liberos esse."

[3] Gal. iii. 1, v. 20.

the languid East that resists the holy spirit.[1] Just as these provinces finally surrendered to Islam because monogamy could not be permanently endured, so Paul strives against the wallowing in sensuality, the joy in uncleanness, the disgusting tendencies, still characteristic of the inhabitants of Asia Minor.[2]

The same reproach had been levelled at the Galatians by the Jewish author of the oldest Sibyl, when he extols the Israelites:

> "— For chaste they keep their bed,
> Nor mingle in abominable lusts,
> As the Phœnicians do, and many more,
> Galatians, Asiatics —"

Drunkenness, too, and revelling are common in the land of the Asiatic Dionysus and the extravagant worship of Cybele. Add to these the hot and passionate blood, the cruel and malignant spirit that hurries only too easily to the murder of an adversary; they complete the works of the flesh in Galatia, which Paul began to combat at his first visit, and concerning which he prophesied, as he had prophesied before, that they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.[3]

On the other hand, the Apostle did not need to combat other works of the flesh. The good-natured, companionable, hospitable descendants of the ancient Phrygians were not proud, covetous or hard-hearted; neither were they haughty and vain, nor slanderous and sycophantic like the Greeks. As for those qualities, however, for which the Phrygians were proverbial, credulity and good-natured readiness to serve strangers, whom under given circumstances they were no less ready to see ill-used and plundered—these, together with irresolution and fickleness, Paul experienced to satiety even among the Christians of Phrygia.

So the Epistle to the Galatians brings before us a perfectly definite combination of virtues and vices, a perfectly definite national individuality. Even within the narrow limits of the little churches then founded by Paul, we can easily recognize

[1] Gal. v. 17. [2] Gal. v. 19. [3] Gal. v. 21, 22.

the characteristics of king Midas' subjects of old as they remain firmly fixed in the record of history.

Our information as to the operations of the Apostle in the individual localities of Galatia are very insufficient. According to the Acts, the synagogue at ANTIOCH was the first at which Paul and Barnabas proclaimed the tidings of the Messiah's coming. Antioch, indeed, was probably the principal town to which our Epistle to the Galatians was addressed. The references in the Epistle to events in a very definite circle show that it was not merely a circular letter, but pre-eminently directed to one definite church.[1] Written on a journey to Macedonia,[2] it would first come into the hands of the Antiochenes, to whose local affairs it makes repeated reference.[3]

If this supposition is correct, we have the following picture of the foundation of the church. Conformably with his own practice and the account of the Acts, Paul first proclaimed to the synagogue the fulfilment of the promises expected by Israel. "Now when the synagogue broke up, many of the Jews and of the devout proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas: who, speaking to them, urged them to continue in the grace of God. And the next Sabbath almost the whole city was gathered together

[1] Gal. iv. 12—19. [2] See below.

[3] Gal. iv. 8—10 is most easily explained as an allusion to the Lunus-worship of the Antiochenes, which Strabo gives an account of (xii. 6). Renan shows, in Paul, p. 81, that the worship of the *μὴν Ἀρκαῖος* flourished in Antioch until the time of Gordianus. Hence Paul: *ἡμέρας παρατηρεῖσθε .... καὶ μῆνας .... πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ, οἷς πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεῦσαι θέλετε*; and it is also with reference to the nature-worship of the *μὴν Ἀρκαῖος* that the Apostle's phrase in iv. 8 is best explained: *ἐδουλεύσατε τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὔσιν θεοῖς*, "Ye were in bondage to them which by nature are no gods." (For the spread of this worship in Phrygia especially, see Pauly, s. vv. Lunus and Sabazius.) The ancient temple was indeed stripped of its treasures when the fiscal of Augustus arrived to take over the domains of Amyntas, but the worship of the god continued. The god Men himself appears on the coinage as a knight with a Phrygian cap and the emblem of the half-moon. The worship of the moon as a male divinity, under the name of Men, Lunus or Attes, had its old home here, and consisted in strict celebration of its periods.

to hear the word of God. But when the Jews saw the multitudes, they were filled with jealousy, and contradicted the things which were spoken by Paul, and blasphemed."[1] Consequently Paul now turned to the Gentiles, appealing to Isaiah xlix. 6: "I have set thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the uttermost part of the earth." In itself, this narrative of the Acts presents no difficulties; but it is closely bound up with the tendency of the book, insisting at every turn that it was the malignant perversity of the Jews which first compelled Paul to separate from them; while as regards Galatia itself, Paul tells of a more fortuitous circumstance which was the occasion of his gathering a pre-eminently Gentile church about him. "Ye know that because of an infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you the first time: and that which was a temptation to you in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected; but ye received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus. . . . For I bear you witness that, if possible, ye would have plucked out your eyes and given them to me."[2] It was therefore illness which either gave occasion for him to make his sojourn at this leading town of Galatia, or which at least produced the intercourse which developed into the formation of a Christian church.

We therefore change from the synagogue to Paul's sick-room as the special centre of the foundation of the church. As we recognize Phrygian good-nature in the hospitality offered to their guest, so, too, we see the peculiar inclination of this home of Cybele-worship and Montanism towards ecstatic communion with the Deity in the manifestations of the spirit in the little church, wherein the children of Asia, undistracted by any reflection, gave themselves up to the enjoyment of their own sensations as something objective. They received the spirit from the preaching of the faith, and, with the elevation of their inward life, an ascendency over other souls. Signs and miracles took place; unprecedented healings and conversions were seen. The stream

[1] Acts xiv. 43, seq. [2] Gal. iv. 12.

of religious excitement, still at its full in Palestine, here ran in narrower branches into distant valleys, so that Church and Apostle alike have no doubt, not merely that they have known God, but rather have been known of God,[1] that God has extended the spirit to them, and done marvellous works among them, entirely through the preaching of faith.[2] So now pulsations emanating from this single impact had made other pulses beat in unison with them far off in Asia Minor. Speeding on from one province to another, they filled the whole empire with belief in the glory to come, which would recompense the faithful for the stress of this evil time.[3]

For here, as everywhere, belief in the approaching end of the world was the axe of John, whose ringing blows shook men's security of heart.[4] They were "running well," as the Apostle could say, looking back upon his sojourn in the chief church of the Galatians, for they followed the way of salvation, they stood in grace;[5] Paul himself was their friend, their angel, their saviour.[6] Few Jews, perhaps none as yet,[7] belonged to the churches; but this did not daunt their courage; it heightened their zeal. So after restoring the churches, Paul was able to leave them with the cheerful knowledge that he had gathered together a faithful band, whom he could feel sure of. "So long as there was yet time," they would walk in the new doctrine, and be zealous for the good, thereafter to meet the approaching Son of God, as being pure and holy.[8]

As regards Paul, this foundation of a "church of the Gentiles" was then clearly an epoch in his own practice. Not that it was his original intention to found churches of Gentiles; he had no need to cross the Taurus and search for Gentiles in the heart of Galatia. He had come here to preach the advent of the Messiah to his distant fellow-countrymen. Only "because of illness"—not to limit the word—had he preached to these Gentiles. It was also, perhaps, the first time that he had been, in the words

[1] Gal. iv. 9. [2] Gal. iii. 4. [3] Gal. i. 4. [4] Gal. vi. 9, 10.
[5] Gal. v. 4. [6] Gal. iv. 14, 16. [7] Gal. v. 9. [8] Gal. vi. 10.

of the Epistle to the Corinthians, "to the Gentiles a Gentile," for he is still conscious that he brought the Galatians a sacrifice by being with them. "Be as I am," he writes in iv. 12, "for I am as ye are." But the sacrifice was worth making. He dared to say with Jesus: "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel."

The Acts, too, though without knowledge of the fortuitous and external occasion of Paul's devoting himself to the Gentiles instead of seeking to establish a reformed synagogue, is right in saying that the church in Antioch was Gentile. According to the Acts, the word of the Lord "spread abroad through all the region," until the Jews used the influence of their female proselytes, devout women of honourable estate, to get Paul and Barnabas expelled from the colony. "They stirred up a persecution and cast them out of their borders."[1] The Epistle to the Galatians also alludes to stormy struggles of the same kind which must have visited the little church after Paul's departure. "Did ye suffer so many things in vain?"[2] cries Paul, bitterly. "As Ishmael, Hagar's son, was a persecutor, so even now do the Jews persecute us, sons of Abraham, the children of promise."[3] If certain Galatian believers vehemently insist that to adopt the law will bring about a good understanding with the synagogue, it is only "that they may not be persecuted for the cross of Christ."[4]

It is surprising to find Paul and Barnabas returning the same way as they had come but a little while before, till, sixty miles to the south, they reach the road to Iconium leading by Lystra and Derbe over the pass of Taurus. Whether this course was adopted by command of the authorities who banished them, or of their choice, or whether they wished to return direct to Paul's native city, is a matter of mere conjecture. On the other hand, the Acts tell that Paul found a favourable base of operations at Iconium as well as Antioch, and stayed some time at this one of the new colonies organized by the reigning emperor. Under

[1] Acts xiii. 50. [2] Gal. iii. 4. [3] Gal iv. 29. [4] Gal. vi. 12.

Tiberius, Strabo had called Iconium a petty town; by the time of Vespasian, Pliny calls it one of the great cities of the world.[1] In the interval it had been founded anew by the reigning emperor, whence it was named Claudiconium. Its new foundation as a military colony was one link in the chain that secured peace in the Taurus. The city was well built, and lay in a fertile region beside a small river which watered the gardens of the city and lost itself in a lake hard by.[2]

According to the Acts, the visit to the Jewish synagogue of Iconium was attended with great success. Yet here, too, Paul must have established a church of his own outside the synagogue. The whole colony was soon divided into two camps, one supporting the synagogue, the other the church founded by Paul. The Jews persecuted the Gentiles; the believers in turn appealed to the visible outpouring of the spirit of God; for here once more the preaching was not so much the presentation of doctrine as the inspired diffusion of its own inspiration, while "the Lord bare witness unto the word of his grace, granting signs and wonders to be done by their hands."

Nor, indeed, was there any lack of the heat and bitterness of rival schools. There are instances to show that in such strife Paul developed a polemic against the Jewish law, which the law itself made punishable. To say in the Epistle to the Romans that the purpose of the law was to provoke to sin; in 2 Cor. to accuse the lawgiver of intentionally deceiving the people of Israel as to the law being a temporary dispensation; in the Epistle to the Galatians, to compare the law to the barren Sinai, and this again to the bondmaid Hagar, who brings forth to bondage,—such expressions constituted attacks for which the zealot for the law would propose to stone Paul with as much justice as he himself had formerly caused Stephen to be stoned for preaching the destruction of the temple.

Matters came to this point, according to the Acts. The chief

[1] Strabo, 668, *πολίχνιον*; Pliny, v. 27, 25, urbs celeberrima. In Renan, l. c., after Abufeda, Tab. xvii.

men of the synagogue of Iconium were furious with Paul's blasphemous words, and demanded the punishment of this stranger. As before, the rulers of the city at last espoused the cause of established and traditional Judaism. As soon as the brethren learnt that the synagogue had been given a free hand by the local Roman authorities either to rebuke the strangers or to stone them, according to the law, the latter fled to Lystra, eight hours' journey distant. But this did not end the struggle. That was impossible from the nature of the case, as is, indeed, confirmed by the fact that several converts were afterwards inclined to revert to Judaism.[1] Still, the church was able to maintain itself alone through these stormy times. Its growing importance can be traced through the New Testament, in which Iconium is mentioned most often of all the churches of Galatia.[2]

Paul's work in Iconium was firmly printed on the memory of the Christians in Asia Minor, as is shown by the story of Paul and Thekla, a composition of the third century.[3] It is a graceful tale of how Paul taught at Iconium in the house of Onesiphorus, and won over a true disciple in Thekla, who was condemned to the stake for her perversion to the new sect. A cloud-burst saves the saint from the flames; she flees to Antioch, accompanies Paul on his journeys, and finally returns to Iconium to end her days in her native land, doing good to all poor and sick. The legend at any rate proves that the memory of Paul was kept green as the founder of the Lycaonian church.

Of all the churches in Galatia, we know least of that at Lystra. The Acts show that we here approach the inhospitable region of Taurus, with the remark that the people of Lystra did not understand Paul's language, nor he theirs. But, so runs the narrative of the Acts, the miraculous cure of a lame man made the inhabitants imagine that Jupiter and Mercury had come down from heaven, as in the days of old, taking the more impres-

[1] Gal. vi. 12. [2] Acts xiii. 51, xiv. 1, xix. 21, xvi. 2; 2 Tim. iii. 11.

[3] Acta Apost. Apocr., Tischendorf, p. 40. Mentioned in Tertullian, De Baptismo, 17.

sive Barnabas for Zeus, the small and eloquent Paul for Hermes, the messenger of the gods, because he was spokesman. The priests of the temple of Jupiter, which stood before the city gates, straightway made ready wreaths and victims for sacrifice; but the misunderstanding was cleared up in due course, and the two strangers remained in the town, to found another church of Gentiles.

But in course of time the Jews of Antioch and Lystra discovered the resting-place of the two sectaries in this remote valley. They stirred up the populace, and this time it actually came to stoning. Paul was cast out of the town for dead; yet the brethren were able to surround him and bring him into a place of safety after he came to. Next day they carried him further off to Derbe.

Doubt has been cast on the reality of this incident, as standing in such close connection with the very mythical story before it, of the healing of the lame man and the sacrifice offered by the people of Lystra. But this connection does not exist,[1] and Paul himself says in 2 Cor. xi. 25: "Once was I stoned." There is no foundation for asserting that the Acts attach this story to the wrong place. An allusion seems also to be made, in Gal. vi. 17, to the fact of his having suffered the most grievous ill-treatment in a church of Galatia, when he appeals to the Galatians: "From henceforth let no man trouble me; for I bear branded on my body the marks of Jesus."

It is very different, of course, with the story of the healing of the lame man and the attempted sacrifice at Lystra. These, indeed, appear to be later embellishments of the events in Galatia. Besides, the healing of the beggar is not the impediment to belief in the historical value of the story. As for

[1] Even apart from the reading in Acts xiv. 18, favoured by Lachmann; for it is not the disillusionment of the people of Lystra at finding men amongst them instead of gods, but the intrigues of foreign Jews, that bring about the stoning, which appears to be the execution of the decree of the synagogue.

miracles, such as were worked in far greater numbers by St. Bernard, or took place by hundreds on the graves of saints, why should they not have a similar place in an earlier time, a time, indeed, which had equal belief in miracles, and therefore saw miracles and worked them? But the historical germ of the story is questionable, because of the presence of all the elements necessary for the origin of such a legend. The second missionary journey, so called, lay, generally speaking, in the districts of ancient Phrygia, where the legend ran how, in days of old, Jupiter and Mercury passed through the land and knocked at the cottages of the barbarians.[1] The attentive reader of the Epistle to the Galatians is reminded of this legend all the more, because it likewise presupposes the inhospitality of the Jews and the hospitality of the Apostle's Gentile host. Now this is the very basis of the well-known tale of Philemon and Baucis.

Moreover, the Apostle says in Gal. iv. 14, that the people of Galatia received him as an angel of God, as Christ Jesus, which to a Gentile again suggests Jupiter and Mercury, the messenger of the gods. Further, the Epistle speaks of the signs and wonders which happened among the Galatians, and of the punishment to which those were liable who spurned God and did not do the works of goodness in due season. All this may have suggested to the author of the Acts the perennial story of Philemon and Baucis, and in this he might see a type of the reception Paul met with from the Galatians. So for him, and perhaps for others before him, the several scenes united upon the basis given in Ovid's Metamorphoses, where the poet tells of the lakes and hills of ancient Phrygia, which Paul and Barnabas in their turn had passed by.

> "A pool stands near, once habitable land,
> But now the haunt of wild-fowl of the mere,
> Divers and coots. Here once in mortal shape

[1] Ovid, Metam. viii. 621—726. Cf. Odyss. xvii. 485:

> "Nay, gods in guise of strangers from all lands,
> In every shape, visit the towns of men."

Came Jupiter and his son Mercury,
Lord of the wand, but of his wings bereft.
House after house they tried in search of rest;
House after house was barred; save one alone,
A tiny cottage thatched with reeds and straw.

. . . . . .

Now when the heavenly pair drew nigh the house,
And stooped their heads to pass the lintel low,
The old man set a seat, and bade them rest;
And Baucis, careful housewife, on the seat
Spread some rude covering from her humble store."

The reception of Paul and Barnabas in Phrygia recalled this entry and these same cottages, and so the legend took shape. As the Phrygians of old took Jupiter and Mercury for men, so now they regarded Barnabas and Paul as Jupiter and Mercury. They had, indeed, received them as angels, as Christ Jesus.[1]

After the two preachers had been forced to fly from Lystra too, they found themselves driven deeper into the mountains, for DERBE, the most easterly hamlet of Galatia, lay actually in the district of the Clitæ, whose robber-chief, Antipater, had chosen it for his stronghold, until Amyntas, king of Galatia, captured the place from him. At this time it was perhaps a Roman fortress, especially as the Acts presuppose a settlement of Jews in the place.[2]

Here, again, a church was founded, which became important in the church at large through the name of TIMOTHEUS, a native of Derbe. As Paul calls Timotheus his "beloved son" as late as 58 in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, he must have been quite youthful in 50—53. However, according to tradition, he belonged to a family which was then converted. According to the Acts, he was the son of a Jewish woman who believed, and a Greek,[3] and the author of 2 Timothy expressly derives Timo-

[1] The dependence of this story on Ovid's Metamorphoses is denied by Friedländer, Vorrede zum Index Lectionum der Univ. Königsberg, Sommersemester, 1875. Possibly the writer of the Acts knew only the story of Baucis and Philemon, or only Odyss. xvii. 485.

[2] xvi. 3. [3] xvi. 1.

theus' religious tendency from the women of the family. The unfeigned faith dwelt first in Lois, his grandmother, and his mother Eunice.[1] These women, then, must be regarded as the devout women of Derbe who bound up the wounds of Paul after he had been stoned, and to whom he also preached on account of the "infirmity of the flesh."

In support of the genuineness of this tradition, the fact may perhaps be adduced that in the second century it was at least possible to know the family relations of a man who did not begin his activity till the middle of the first. On the other hand, it must be confessed, Lois and Eunice are very strange names for Jewesses.

Before long, active intercourse was established between the churches of Derbe, Lystra and Iconium, in which the youthful Timotheus soon developed the activity and zeal that disclosed to Paul the missionary nature in him, soon to be devoted to wider spheres.[2] Paul and Barnabas themselves could reach Tarsus most directly from Derbe by the Cilician Gates, the famous pass leading over the mountains to Cilicia. But according to the Acts, the two wandering preachers preferred to return by their former route through Galatia, which may point to a lengthy stay at Derbe. Of Perga in Pamphylia, we learn that this time they preached the Lord there in the synagogue without hesitation. Then, instead of descending to the mouth of the Cestrus, they wandered on to Attalia at the mouth of the Catarrhactes, to take ship thence to Antioch.[3] Thus the news of the Messiah's appearance was carried into the synagogues of the interior and was ready to work further upon men's minds.

We are not told how the churches left here were organized. But in one passage[4] Paul implies the reading of the Greek Bible before the devout congregations of Christians, and his whole Epistle shows that the Old Testament was soon familiar

[1] 2 Tim. i. 5.
[2] Acts xvi. 2.
[3] Acts xiv. 26; Gal. i. 22, ii. 1.
[4] Gal. iv. 21.

to the churches and became the central point for their edification. A written gospel, too, can hardly have been wanting.

Thus the earliest churches of Gentile Christians are organized on the same lines as those of Jewish Christians. Still this advance of Christianity into Galatia marks a step of great importance, establishing the Christian faith at a safe distance from the fortunes of Palestine. Here in the heart of Asia Minor the "kingdom" found a different basis from that in the ancient home of David and Solomon. The farther removed from Jerusalem, the more must the idea of the kingdom be conceived of in its universal bearings. Important consequences, therefore, flowed from the transference of the gospel to a new climate and a nation indifferent to the walls and gates of Jerusalem. Some of these consequences found immediate expression on Paul's return to Antioch. To this extent the "first missionary journey" so called actually plays a great part in the history of Christianity.

Nearly seventeen years had now passed since the conversion of the Apostle, and almost fourteen during which he had been actively engaged in Syria, Cilicia and Galatia. Considering the length of this period and the extent of the field, history has preserved an infinitesimal amount. The two or three narratives of this period we possess fade away like an uncertain gleam under a cloudy sky. On the other hand, the picture stands out proportionately clearer when we hear what the Apostle himself has to say some years later of his past years of wandering. His testimony is that they were full of much labour, of stripes above measure, of imprisonments and frequent peril of death. "Of the Jews," he says, "five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods (by Roman authorities), once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day have I been in the deep; (a minister of Christ) in journeyings often, in perils of rivers, in perils of robbers, in perils from my countrymen, in perils from the Gentiles, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils

among false brethren; in labour and travail, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness. Beside the things that come out of course, there is that which presseth upon me daily, anxiety for all the churches."[1]

These few lines, indeed, give a very different colour to the Apostle's anxious and troubled life from what was known of it in the middle of the following century. History has no thought for the suffering of the labourer who seeks out his fellow-countrymen in distant colonies and is rejected there by his own nation. History thinks of speeches in a crowded basilica, of superstitious reverence or furious riots of a bigoted populace. Weariness, hunger, vigils, stripes, are not matters worth remembering. The martyrdom related by the Apostle could not be realized in its full extent amid the glitter of Rome. To this very day few would have any conception of what it meant to seek out Jewish colonies in the valleys of the Karadagh among the predatory Caramans, to be rejected by these colonies, and abandoned, nay, consigned to the discipline of these warlike tribes and the ill-treatment of the natives. Yet such is the picture of the period drawn for us in the Apostle's account of his own life.

---

4. The Struggle over Circumcision.

The spirit of the Oriental is wedded to traditional forms far more than the Occidental spirit. Conformity to tradition is the characteristic of his art, his science and his religion. Therefore a law and traditional usages are the things pleasing to God, and for the same reason all religions of the East are ritual religions, propitiating God by holy custom, definite ablutions, definite prayers and definite pilgrimages. Conformably with this spirit, the struggles which Paul carried through in the Eastern field

[1] 2 Cor. xi. 23—30.

of his labours were very different from his controversies with the Greeks. With the latter he strove concerning doctrine, resurrection and immortality, their unbounded subjectivity producing customs "which we have not, neither the churches of God." All over the East the burning question was, What is the relation in which the uncircumcised followers of the Messiah stand to the Jewish law? Are circumcision and Jewish ceremonies necessary to their justification, or, if they persist in the Gentile life, will the Messiah justify their hopes?

Paul had not pledged the newly-founded Galatian churches to the law, nor circumcised the males amongst them. This was a new practice of his own, as is shown by the quarrel which immediately broke out on the question. If he had worked for the last fourteen years so that even the brethren in Judæa "praised God for him," but now is suddenly met by passionate opposition, it must have been he who altered somewhat from his former practice. He himself admits that during his long missionary life he was at one time a Jew to the Jews, at another a Greek to the Greeks; to those under the law as one under the law, to those without the law as one without it.[1] His Galatian opponents further reproach him with elsewhere preaching circumcision; and he only denies that he continues to preach it.[2] It follows that this change of procedure must fall within the time in which this reproach is levelled against him, viz. during his missionary work in Galatia.

The first place where this question came to be discussed was of necessity Antioch, where Paul and Barnabas had returned towards the end of Claudius' reign.[3] The church of this great city was now in the second decade of its vigour, and was, so to say, the parent church of the Cilician, Cyprian and Galatian churches. On the one hand, it had learnt of the growth of the Gentile churches, standing in a position of greater liberty than itself; on the other, it stood in close connection with Jerusalem,

[1] 1 Cor. ix. 19, seq. [2] Gal. v. 11.

[3] Gal. ii. 1. In the year 52-53.

where the customs even of the Syrian churches were found far too free. Antioch, then, was the geographical meeting-point of the opposite conceptions of Christian Jews and Hellenists. Both sides, too, were advancing.

At Jerusalem, John Mark had been the herald of Paul's doings, and not perhaps giving an impartial account of the undertaking which he himself had given up in the savage country about Perga. In any case, there could be no doubt as to the results of a deliberate mission to the heathen there. The Jewish Christians were still in a decided majority; but if a further development took place along the lines successively laid down in Antioch, Pamphylia and Galatia, the Jews of Jerusalem would needs enter, step by step, into an association essentially outside Judaism. A momentous question confronted the primitive Church, at a time when it was more Jewish than ever in thought, under the influence of the defeat of Caligula and the victory of Pharisaism. Was it ready to see a universal Church founded outside Judaism, according to the injunction laid upon it, or would it maintain the historical tradition that salvation was promised to the seed of Abraham alone, and only recognize as brethren those who submitted to the law? The more zealous at last saw that they should never have allowed matters to go so far. Some of them attempted to restore obedience to the law in Antioch itself.

It is then, probably, no chance coincidence that at the moment of the foundation of Gentile Christianity in Galatia, the church in Antioch is required to circumcise Gentile brethren. This requisition was a very intelligible reaction against Paul's mission. With the freedom secured by life in a great mart, the Syrian brethren had disregarded the precepts of the law—at least, in their intercourse with Gentile brethren.[1] They met one another at love-feasts without a thought that the Jew was forbidden to sit at table with the uncircumcised, and that in the eyes of the Rabbis the bread brought to the common meal by the Gentile

[1] Gal. ii. 12, 14, seq.

was worse than unclean meat. So it was not the Antiochenes, accustomed from youth up to lax customs, but Jewish Christians, newly come from Jerusalem, who protested against this un-Jewish life, and declared to the Gentiles: "Except ye be circumcised after the custom of Moses, ye cannot be saved."[1] The Jewish Christians of Antioch had to be reminded in their turn that the promises of the old covenant were bound up with the fulfilment of the law, and that Messiah would only come to save a people who kept the law. Considering the traditional subservience of the East to the ancient and sacred customs of their forefathers; considering, in particular, how strong a power the Jewish usage had over the individual Jew, who had drunk in with his mother's milk the belief that his nation was pleasing to God beyond all other nations,—it must be confessed that it could not possibly have been easy in this time of religious strife for a Jew to range himself on the side of the uncircumcised.

Paul now assailed this natural prejudice with the radicalism of a theology which swept away all historical vehicles. The kingdom is attained by a new spiritual birth; Jew or Christian, it makes no difference, for we are a new creation in Christ. From this point of view, the carnal preference of belonging to Israel might even become a peril, for it deluded the believer into "putting his confidence in the flesh." So far Paul himself says: "What things were gain to me, these I counted loss and refuse for the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus, that I may gain Christ and be found in him, not having a righteousness of mine own, even that which is of the law, but that which is through faith in Christ; that I may know him and the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of his sufferings; becoming conformed unto his death."[2]

This was a height of Christian consciousness at which all Jews were not able to place themselves. They had been told from infancy up what high preference they possessed over the uncircumcised—a piece of aristocratic conceit the more firmly rooted

[1] Acts xv. 1, seq. [2] Phil. iii. 4—10.

as it was a part of their religious conviction. In addition, the fear of pollution from the Gentile had been so strongly impressed on the true Jew from his youth, that even the most emancipated were moved with no ordinary feelings at every contact with the Gentile. To live with the Gentiles is by no means a matter of course even with Paul: each time it was an act of resolve and self-conquest of which he was perfectly conscious.[1]

The question whether the carnal preference of being an Israelite was of any importance in the kingdom of the Messiah, was followed by another and a wider question. Is the law still binding upon all and several in the kingdom of the Messiah? Is its validity merely not inconsistent with the state of salvation through Christ? Here, too, Pauline theology gave very radical answers. A law which, according to the Apostle's theology, was only intended to provoke the flesh to sin, could not possibly continue to be binding upon those who were born anew in Christ. This law was given to confirm men in sin till grace should be vouchsafed to them: but now that grace had been given, it was no longer binding on one to fulfil a law which was only meant to be a discipline until the day of redemption appointed by God.

All the profundity, all the paradoxical bluntness, of the Pauline views must have appeared in this question. It is easy to imagine how infuriated his adversaries were at these speculations, which limited the scope of the law to increasing human sin, to laying us under a curse, and so reserving the elect for grace. His inference that a new spirit was needful for salvation, while the law was incapable of imparting any spirit, and was nothing more than characters in black and white, the killing and petrifying letter, seemed to them "handling the word of God deceitfully."[2] At best, they called such preaching a "veiled gospel," taunting Paul with preaching, not the Word of God, but "himself," that is to say, his dreams.[3] In matters of the law, too,

[1] Cf. Gal. iv. 12; 1 Cor. ix. 21.

[2] 2 Cor. iv. 2.

[3] 2 Cor. iv. 3, 5.

they had the express words of Scripture on their side, most clearly uttered in Deuteronomy, that he alone should live who fulfilled the law.

Thus the Apostle's position was anything but favourable. He rushes to desperate means. In order to take the sting from the eternal validity of the law, he actually declares that Moses deliberately deceived Israel as to the transitory nature of the old covenant. And so in 2 Cor. iii. 11, he arrives at the astonishing explanation that he himself is in the right as a preacher of the gospel, not doing as Moses, who put a veil upon his face to prevent the children of Israel from seeing that the glory upon his face from the revelation of Sinai was only transitory. By continuing ever after to veil his face, Moses produced the belief that the glory of the law was imperishable, whereas in reality a time was appointed for it to fade away.[1]

Explanations such as these naturally did more to exasperate than to convince believers in the law. They were so strikingly the outcome of a religious view of the world entirely from the individualistic side, and only comprehensible from this side, that they could not fail to remain a "veiled gospel" to any other mode of thought. Paul's uncompromising expressions about the law and the lawgiver were met by corresponding zeal on the other side amongst those who were still "in bondage." The spiritual calm and inward peace which consecrated the dawn of Christianity, gave place to acrimonious controversy in which spiritual life could not thrive. Differences were insisted on more than points in common. The strict Jewish Christians thought it more important to defend the Jewish than the Christian features of the Church. Considering this zeal of now purely Jewish tinge, Paul might doubt how far such men were in earnest with their belief in Christ, when all their warmth of feeling was devoted, not to Jesus, but to the law. "What have they to do with us?" asks the Apostle.[2] "They will not be edified with the church; all their energy goes to spying *whether any one*

[1] 2 Cor. iii. 4—18. [2] Gal. ii. 3—5.

break the law. They came in privily and pose as brethren, but only to destroy our liberty and bring us again into bondage."

The success of this effort on the part of the Pharisees would of course be to merge Christianity once more in Judaism. But when the Apostle represents the possible consequence of this retrograde movement as originally devised by the Pharisees, it is clear how bitter the antagonism between them had grown. As so often happens in a polemic, he confounds result with purpose. The nature of the case scarcely admits of doubt that the Pharisees joined the Church, not as spies, but as believers. While, then, Paul goes too far in seeing nothing but hypocrisy and Pharisaic self-seeking in the scruples of the Palestinians, attempting to reduce the Gentile Christians to a state of dependence, the Judaists, on the other hand, advanced to the inadmissible proposition that the very missions to the Gentiles were forbidden, because the promise of the Messianic kingdom held good, not for the Gentiles, but for the Jews alone.[1]

How deeply the Apostle was stirred and shaken by these questions is shown by the fact that, in Gal. ii. 2, he tells again of one of those visions which in his case usually accompanied the travail of great decisions.[2] And indeed the question was nothing less than whether Christianity should become a religion of formalism and ritual, of ablutions, purifications, and ordinances concerning meats, or whether it should maintain the idea of Jesus, that God desires nothing of man but his heart, and that the kingdom of God consists, not in fasts or eating, but in a holy state of mind. Well might the vast consequences of this decision stir the Apostle profoundly. He tells us himself that he had in view the whole Gentile world, and especially the newly-founded Galatian churches, when he resisted the demand for circumcision.[3]

[1] In Gal. ii. 9, at all events, Paul considers it a victory that the apostles who were pillars of the church did not demur to the justification of missions to the Gentiles.

[2] So Acts xvi. 9, xviii. 9.

[3] Gal. ii. 5 gives a striking proof that the churches of the Epistle to the Galatians were then in existence.

Whether the revelation Paul had at this crisis consisted of a vision, a dream, or an inward voice, we do not know, for the writer of the Acts derives his resolutions from no such source, but from a decree of the administrators of the church of Antioch.[1] According to his own account, a divine voice gave the impulse—an impulse, indeed, entirely consonant with the Apostle's inmost heart. Paul was accustomed to go to the root of things. On this as on other occasions he resolved to struggle no longer with subordinates, but to go up to Jerusalem to try conclusions with the primitive apostles in person. The primitive Church was to decide as to the relation in which it stood to the churches, which he had gained at such a sacrifice. "I wished to ask them," he says, "whether by any means I should be running, or had run, in vain."[2]

His natural companion on this grave journey was Barnabas, who must have stood in favour with the parent church ever since the community of goods, and moreover had shared with Paul the successes of Christian preaching in Asia Minor without turning back, like John Mark, who found the crossing of the Taurus too much for him. At the same time, Paul found it convenient to take a brother from the Gentiles with him to Jerusalem, and put it to the proof whether they would accord him Christian communion without more ado, or would enforce circumcision. The Greek Titus, first mentioned in this connection, was a man whose character commanded respect and ripened in the course of life.[3] Paul also employed him on other difficult missions.

Eighteen years had passed since the death of Jesus when Paul, with Barnabas and Titus, appeared at Jerusalem in the year 53. For eighteen years the return of the Master had been awaited by the Galilean community which had gone up to the Holy City. Meanwhile, they had been forced to learn that a longer period must elapse before the "latter days," so called. We have seen how, in consequence of this, the life of the church

[1] Acts xv. 2. [2] Gal. ii. 2. [3] 2 Cor. vii. 13, 16.

had slipped back more and more into the usual groove of Jewish life. The enthusiasm of the early days and the grand example of Jesus had indeed raised the disciples for a while above the minute scruples of the ritual law; but it is only part of the natural return to a more abstinent mode of life to find members of the Church once more fulfilling the law with all the exactitude customary in Jerusalem. Any exception to it would only have accentuated the hostility which, as it was, bore heavily enough upon the churches of Judæa.[1]

But the question of the right attitude towards the Gentiles which agitated Antioch did not exist for the ordinary man in Jerusalem. It was an exception to see a Gentile in the city; and the decision of purely theological questions was not the task of the believers who awaited the Messiah. If, then, observance of the Jewish law had nevertheless continued unchanged among the Twelve ever since the ferment of the first days, how much less probability was there now of the disciples resolving to change their customs, when the majority amongst them had reached the age at which in the course of things men regularly become more conservative. All things considered, then, there was little prospect of material agreement. But there was no question yet of fundamental decisions as to the binding value of the law and standards of the Church, so long as there existed no ecclesiastical organization, no common union of the several churches. The question was simply whether the disciples of Jesus would recognize the uncircumcised as full-born members of the kingdom, or would deny them communion.

This particular question would be decided practically if the Apostles accepted Titus as one of the brethren. As might be expected, the party of the Pharisees offered vigorous resistance to this. They required the Greek brought with him by Paul to become a Jew before sharing in the meetings and love-feasts of the Church. Now however adroit and pliant as a rule in his regard for circumstances, on this point the Apostle did not

[1] 1 Thess. ii. 14.

hesitate for a moment, for in his eyes Titus was the representative of all Gentile Christian churches, so that the question affected the whole body of Gentiles.[1] Whatever the Twelve really wished, they did not compel Titus to submit to circumcision, and the Pharisees did not persist in their demand.[2] Moreover, now that the Gentile Christian churches were organized, the Apostle had no intention of submitting the question to the decision of the church of Jerusalem, but tried to arrive at a private understanding with James, Peter and John, the most influential leaders of the Palestinian church. In a remarkable speech he laid before them the gospel which he preached to the Gentiles. They were in perfect accord with him on the cardinal point that Christ had died for us according to the Scriptures, and that our salvation rests solely upon his vicarious suffering. So they did not forbid Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship of the church. Both might go forth, where Jews would not hear, to preach the gospel to the Gentiles and friends of the Jews; but they themselves were unwilling to work as before among the circumcised. Such is the division of his sphere of work more and more insisted on by Paul.[3] Yet this did not prevent those of Jerusalem, and James in particular, from expecting in the future, and from their own exertions, a further conversion of Gentile brethren, even to union with the church of Israel.

The consequence was that the point at issue was only deferred, not decided. It was left open to question whether Gentile believers in Christ must be circumcised, or might remain in their freedom from the law until the Lord himself should decide the question. The one point on which all agreed was, that if Paul could convince proselytes and Gentiles of the Messianity of Jesus, no obstacle should be put in his way. Remarkable as it was, it must be admitted that the conference with the heads of the young Church had not for Paul himself the significance

[1] Gal. ii. 5. [2] Ibid.

[3] Gal. ii. 7—19; 2 Cor. x. 13—16; Rom. xi. 13, xv. 14—16.

afterwards ascribed to it when this same question led to a factious schism.[1] Paul refers to this meeting but once, and then only to show that it produced no tangible result.

Yet it remains a striking proof of how strongly he was inspired by the spirit of love, when we find that this question, so vital to a Jew, was not of sufficient importance in his eyes to make him refuse his support to the Church. Paul's calling by Christ was acknowledged, though there is no question of acknowledging his Apostolate. "They perceived the grace that was given unto him;" and so far a common ground of union was established for mutual good-will. By this time the destitution of the brethren in Jerusalem had become so great that the original Church would scarcely have been able to exist much longer without assistance from the churches abroad. At all events, the Apostle tells that the one thing desired by the heads of the original Church was that the Gentile churches should send help to poverty-stricken Jerusalem. Paul eagerly undertook a task which gave new scope to his energies without compromising his principle.

It is only too clear that the position of Jerusalem at this moment must have been truly pitiable. The patriotic movement among the Jews rose steadily higher. The administration of the last procurator, Cumanus, had already caused the first bloodshed. Cumanus was succeeded in the year 52 or 53 by one of Claudius' freedmen, Antonius Felix, who, according to Tacitus, exercised imperial power with servile illiberality. Brother of the all-powerful favourite Pallas, he plundered his unhappy provinces with impunity. Under him sprang up banditti and assassins, the inevitable accompaniments of misrule and famine in Israel. Famine soon became chronic; and in the following years, foreshadowing the vast emigrations of later days, we hear much of travelling Christians, who consume the church abroad, claiming its substance as their own and making their belly their God.[2]

[1] The account in the Acts will be discussed in its proper place.

[2] 2 Cor. xii. 13; Phil. iii. 19.

One effect of this distress upon the outstanding question was the agreement that the brethren were to collect alms among the Gentiles to relieve the destitute. Paul was zealous to do so. "To work that which is good to all men, and especially toward them that are of the household of the faith," is henceforth a constant exhortation in his Epistles. "God loveth a cheerful giver;" "He that soweth sparingly shall reap sparingly;"[1] in such words he reminds the Gentile churches of the destitution of the brethren. He entrusted the duty of conveying the collection to the same Titus who had accompanied him to Jerusalem. It may be that he then designated Titus to the brethren as the man who would help them.[2]

Meanwhile, however friendly the parting of the Christian leaders after the conference at Jerusalem, the actual question at issue had not reached a settlement. Paul had secured his sphere of operations against the intrusion of Pharisaically inclined preachers from Palestine, by means of an understanding with the authorities whom they recognized; he had intended to save his churches from the demand for the fulfilment of the law, but this was the very point on which an understanding had not been arrived at. The Apostles who were pillars of the Church remained as they were, "Apostles of the circumcision," and made no demands for operations outside the sphere of Judaism. They had been sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and knew that all the cities of Israel would not be visited before the coming of the Lord. They therefore left the work of winning over proselytes to Paul.

In this, the brother from Tarsus was acknowledged to possess a special gift of grace; but it deserves to be noticed that Paul makes no mention of an acknowledgment of his Apostolate even where he proceeds to justify it on these very grounds. Consequently the differences on this point were not adjusted. They did but find their true beginning when the struggle over the law made it necessary to set up one authority against another.

[1] Gal. vi. 10; 2 Cor. ix. 6, 7. [2] Gal. ii. 10; 2 Cor. viii. 16, seq.

Nor was freedom from the law accorded to the Gentile Christians any more than an independent Apostolate to Paul. The result of the conference at Jerusalem was simply that zealots for the law everywhere dogged the footsteps of the Apostle, to bring the higher seal of circumcision wherever he had gathered congregations of Gentiles.

Yet it must not be overlooked that the primitive Church itself was divided in opinion. A strong party, which must have included James, the brother of the Lord, demanded circumcision. In spite of them, Titus was not forced to undergo the rite. So afterwards in Antioch, Peter appears more moderate and yielding than the friends of James: so in Galatia, Paul appeals to the fact that the Apostles themselves did not set their demands so high as their professed emissaries. In Corinth, too, the situation repeats itself. Foreign intruders threaten them with an apostolic arbitrator to come: but when there actually appeared "some with epistles of commendation," the tension grew less instead of greater, and the only question left for the order of of the day was the relief of the poor in Jerusalem.[1]

The brethren of Antioch perhaps reckoned on this moderate position of Peter's when they designated him to visit their church at Antioch in person and make acquaintance with their customs. His visit, which must have taken place not long after the conference at Jerusalem, appeared at first to confirm these hopes. So long as Peter alone enjoyed the hospitality of Antioch, all difficulties appeared, in truth, to be removed. He ate with the Gentiles; indeed, he lived like the Gentiles, as Paul puts it;[2] so that in accommodating himself to Syrian customs he seems to have gone beyond simple participation in the agapes.

Now when the chief of the disciples ranged himself on the side of freedom, the Jewish party in Antioch might well be regarded as utterly vanquished. But it soon appeared that Peter, as usual, had rushed impetuously into a position which remained intrinsically foreign to him. Recognizing its nature,

[1] Cf. 2 Cor. i.—ix. in its relation to 2 Cor. xi. xii. [2] Gal. ii. 14.

he cried out, as in the legend of the lake, "Lord, I perish." Peter, Judas, Barsabas and Silas, were not indeed the final representatives of Jerusalem to undertake the journey to their great sister-church of Antioch; but whether invited by the Jewish Christians, or sent by James, or of their own motion, several Pharisaic friends of James had set out for Antioch. Before these witnesses from the original centre, the chief of the Apostles failed to maintain his new departure.

It would not be fair to underrate the difficulty of the situation in which Simon Barjonah had placed himself. His and James' friends, with whom he was bound to continue his work in Jerusalem, insisted that he should adopt the same attitude in Antioch as in Jerusalem. He should not in one place refuse the law the obedience which he accorded it in the other. On the other hand, he had already committed himself to the customs of Antioch, and could not draw back without incurring the universal condemnation of the church that had entertained him.[1] Finally, his old associates and regard for Jerusalem prevailed. "He drew back and separated himself, fearing them that were of the circumcision." The result was that his change of front brought on him the ill-will of all Gentile Christianity. They had believed they had before them one of those "who were reputed to be pillars;" they now saw a reed shaken by the wind.

It was otherwise with the Jewish Christians. For them his example was decisive. They allowed themselves to be convinced that it was equally the duty of Jesus' followers to fulfil the law of their ancestors. So strong was the influence of Jerusalem on those of the circumcision, that even Barnabas recalled his descent from the tribe of Levi, and ranged himself with the Jews, after all his years of work with Paul. This act shows, at any rate, that Paul did not turn away from the law till quite late; otherwise, Barnabas' hanging back is utterly inconceivable. He could not now take two steps back unless believing that he had advanced a step too far.

[1] Gal. ii. 11.

It was, of course, impossible to maintain the separation at meals. Unity was broken, but must be restored. Let the Gentile Christians submit to circumcision, and eating in common should be re-established. At this demand, Paul rose up with all the moral force of his logical character. To him it seemed "that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel." Nay, more: he thought it mere dissimulation[1] when he saw men such as his companion Barnabas begin to observe the hours of prayer which they had neglected for years; when he saw distinctions drawn between clean and unclean by Christians who up to this moment had said, in their Master's words, that to the pure all things are pure; when he saw them shrink scrupulously from the Gentile brethren, though but yesterday they had dipped their hand in the same dish with them. "The rest of the Jews dissembled likewise with Peter, insomuch that even Barnabas was carried away with their dissimulation." Such is the laconic account which Paul gives us from these days of Jewish reaction. When now Peter came out with the demand that the uncircumcised should make overtures of peace and submit to the law, Paul resisted him "before them all," that is to say, before the congregation. In the presence of all the brethren of Antioch and the strangers from Jerusalem, Paul retorted upon him, "If thou, being a Jew, livest as do the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, how compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?"

It is clear from the arguments directed by Paul, according to his own account,[2] against the chief Apostle's demand for the recognition of the law by the Christians, that the struggle between the two sections was conducted in the manner of the scribes, Paul at every point contesting the binding power of the law from the central conceptions of his theology. To convince both sides, Paul first laid down the principle that no flesh can be justified by the works of the law; otherwise the Jewish Christians would not have sought justification through belief in

[1] Gal. ii. 13. [2] Gal. i. 15.

the Messiah, but would have remained satisfied with fulfilling the law.

Now this principle involved the admission that the Jew, no less than the "sinner among the Gentiles," was sold under sin, and was by nature sinful. This was equally acknowledged by the Jewish Christians; but they inferred from it the more strongly that man needed the barrier of the law, and, against Paul, held that if the striving after justification in Christ led to overriding the law and giving full play to the principle of sin, then they would hold Christ to be the cause of lawlessness and a minister of sin. Possessed by this fear, they fled back to the law, though admitting in principle that justification came only through the Messiah.

It is easy to see how Jewish thought could be so illogical. The pride and joy of the Jews of the Old Testament, the purity of the people from the uncleanness and godlessness of the Gentiles, and their consecration in the eye of Jehovah given by the law, were at an end if the law were surrendered. The barrier between God's people and Gentile dogs would be overthrown.[1] If this is the consequence of striving to be justified in Christ, then Christ is a minister of sin. Man is but flesh, and without the barrier of the law would only lead a life in the sin of the flesh.

Plausible as it sounds, Paul mercilessly exposed the fallacy on which this reasoning was based. It all follows, he explains, if you once admit the error that the regenerate in Christ are still under the law. He who first seeks justification in Christ, and then again sets up the law which he had thereby declared to be superfluous and abolished—he certainly sets himself down as a transgressor; he assuredly found Christ a minister of sin. For the very attempt to find justification in Christ, the very belief that Christ had died for our sins, are in themselves the dissolution of the law. Whoever, then, after conversion to Christ, returns to the law, acknowledges that he

[1] Cf. Holsten, Das Evang. des Paulus u. Petrus, p. 362.

ought rather to have sought justification in the law, and that consequently to rest upon the sacrificial death of Christ was a transgression, and Christ was his minister to sin. But the opposite is the case. The believer who has once reached Christ is dead to sin. "I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me; and that life which I now live in the flesh, I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself up for me." But if the flesh has died in the death of Christ, there is no need of any barrier by the law. If Christ lives in me, there is no need of any written standard, for it is Christ alone who thinks and wills and acts in me. On the contrary, whoever would now seek justification in the way of the law would then despise the grace offered in Christ, and declare it superfluous for God to have given his Son. "For if righteousness is through the law, then Christ died for nought."[1]

Paul, then, met Peter's action with the settled concepts of his theology. Compromise—such as was afterwards thought of by the writer of the Acts—was impossible here, for Paul is not haggling over more or less of the law. It was indifferent to him whether the Pentateuch or the Decalogue or the ordinances of Noah should be made the condition of belonging to Christ. Before his view of man's regeneration in the Messiah, the law became meaningless, and this view he put very clearly before the representatives of Jerusalem. Here in Antioch, however, they did not part so amicably as in Jerusalem, where Paul had also laid before the Apostles "the gospel which he preached among the Gentiles." It seems that he himself spoke very sharply; at least, the Jewish Christians from this time forth make a regular business of disturbing his work. But in reality, a point of view so thoroughly individualistic, based upon the premisses of a special system, could not easily become that of the whole community. Only disciples who assumed his system could, under these circumstances, work with Paul. This explains why even Barnabas

[1] Gal. ii. 14—21.

now parted from Paul. Yet it is not as though he had immediately sunk back into Judaism. This was not the memory of him kept by the early Church, otherwise the strongly anti-Jewish Epistle of Barnabas could not have been ascribed to him, nor would Paul mention him to the Corinthians as his friend even after the separation.[1] The Acts, indeed, professes to know nothing of differences in principle, but simply traces the quarrel to the fact that Paul refused to take John Mark with him a second time. Still the fact remains that Paul and Barnabas separated immediately after the conflict in Antioch, and that Paul adduced this conflict to the Galatians as the cause of the breach with his former fellow-labourer in their churches.

Thus he found himself compelled to seek new helpers in his mission. Outside the circumcision there were still men like Silas, one of the prophets of Jerusalem, who must therefore have taken part with him in the struggle at Antioch, and Timotheus, avowedly circumcised by him, whom he enlisted during his second stay in Galatia. It is not long, however, before we see him surrounded by a number of Gentile preachers of the Messiah's coming, a most unusual phenomenon at this time, which, it is clear, could but deepen the distrust of Christians who clung to the law. A dangerous rift had opened between the Apostles and Paul; yet the division betokens no severance. The first generation was superior to its successors in acting on the principle that Christians contend as though they contend not. Opinions differed, and this disunion was to lead to bitter struggles; but all remained ready for the common work; all were assured that in the end the Master would decide at his advent. Paul may speak very bitterly of "the vainglorious" and those who are "too much apostles," but he never ceases to bear in his heart the distress of the brethren in Palestine; he speaks of Barnabas after all with esteem,[2] and does not challenge the possession of the true spirit and the true gospel

[1] 1 Cor. ix. 6. [2] Ibid.

by the leaders at Jerusalem.[1] That they would rather quench the zeal of hot-headed Pharisees than fan it, is a direct inference from the withdrawal of Peter at Antioch, as well as from the happy issue of similar disturbances at Corinth. Without some such inward bond, it would be inconceivable that Paul could have appeared again as the guest of the parent Church—thrice, according to the Acts, and once, at all events, according to his own letters. It is equally clear that the Jewish emigrants, who now began continually to overflow the churches abroad, observed the extreme requirements of the law. Paul was met by traces of these machinations when he came back to Galatia in the same year.

5. The Struggle in Galatia.

The separation between the labours of the followers and opponents of the Jewish law was carried out in the departure of Barnabas with John Mark for Cyprus, while Paul took Silas with him to Cilicia, where he appears to have made his new companion known to the churches already established there.[2] The magnanimity of the Tarsian, it is clear, harboured no grudge against the primitive Church, for his object in thus visiting the older churches was to collect relief for the poor of Jerusalem. The same object led him onwards into Galatia,[3] and this time he chose the shortest route by the Pylæ Ciliciæ. "The Cilician Gate," says Diodorus, "is a narrow defile stretching for twenty stades, shut in on either side by the steep walls of extraordinarily lofty and inaccessible mountains. From hence the road leads down to the plain."[4] Great were the effects these two travellers were destined to produce upon the pass which they were now traversing, the name of Jesus in their hearts. It was their doing that in the succeeding centuries this track echoed with the tramp of

[1] 2 Cor. xi. 4.
[2] Acts xv. 41.
[3] Gal. vi. 9, seq.; 1 Cor. xvi. 1.
[4] Diod. Bibl. xiv. 20.

the pilgrims of the cross, seeking the very spot from which Paul had turned away.

On reaching Derbe, almost the first care of the Apostle was to enlist a new helper for his own mission. For while the disciples of Jesus used to go forth two and two, Paul—as indeed was expedient on many grounds—preferred these companies of travellers to consist of three. As once he set forth with Barnabas and Mark, and now with Silas and Timotheus, so in later times he worked with Titus and Timotheus in Macedonia and Achaia, and again set out for Rome with two companions, Luke and Aristarchus.

TIMOTHEUS, the ardent youth whom Paul and Silas here took as their companion conformably with this principle, was already famous for the assiduity with which he had supported the Christian churches in Derbe, Lystra and Iconium.[1] Among the disciples of the Apostle, none has left behind him so tangible a portrait as he; for a writer of the second century, starting from a short Epistle of Paul's to Timotheus, took the opportunity of setting forth his maxims of ecclesiastical law and pastoral wisdom in two Epistles to Timothy. Thanks to these Epistles, we possess a complete epic of Timotheus, which very probably contains historical elements. It is, perhaps, no mere play of creative fancy when the writer professes to know that Timothy was superior to all others in reading, exhortation and teaching.[2] In any case it follows, from the Apostle's own letters, that Paul ventured to entrust important undertakings to this "son of his heart, his beloved child in the Lord."

Looking at the Apostle's own remarks upon Timothy, we find modesty, even diffidence, appearing as a fundamental trait in his character, so that Paul occasionally recommends a kind reception to be given him, that he may come forward "without fear."[3] Strong natures like Paul often feel an inward attraction towards calm and retiring supporters of this kind. In this way Paul far preferred the diffident Timothy to all his other

[1] Acts xvi. 2. [2] Tim. iv. 12. [3] 1 Cor. xvi. 10.

fellow-workers.[1] In him, indeed, he was not deceived. In persecution and in prison, his youthful companion remained true, where stronger men had given way. The legendary account of Timothy gives him endless youth—a Christian Achilles—so that even in the Epistles to Timothy, supposed to be written at the end of the Apostle's career, he appears as young as when the Apostle first enlisted him in his sacred labours.[2] Nay, more; at the date of the composition of the pastoral Epistles he stood so high in the estimation of the Church that his career was believed to have been foretold by the word of the prophets,[3] while he himself was considered the true disciple of Paul, as tradition was most eager to prove.[4]

In immediate connection with the statement that this was the date at which Timothy became Paul's follower, we have in the Acts the account of his circumcision by Paul on account of the Jews, who knew that his father was a Greek. This statement carries little credibility in face of the principles upheld by Paul both in Jerusalem and Antioch. Its likelihood is further diminished by the statement which follows immediately in the Acts, that Paul and Silas proceeded to publish the ordinances of the Apostles in the Galatian churches, making the laws of Noah obligatory on the Gentile brethren. The Epistle to the Galatians shows, on the contrary, that Paul was then engrossed in very different cares. For the addition of Timothy to his band of disciples was really the only ray of comfort which cheered the Apostle during his second stay in Galatia. During his absence in Syria and Jerusalem, and again in Antioch, the tendencies he had found it necessary to combat in Galatia had been growing stronger. It is possible, as is generally assumed, that influences from Antioch or Jerusalem were actively employed here during the interval. Still the Apostle himself seems to regard "certain who trouble the Church" as resident in Galatia. Indeed, it is only too easy to understand that the individual Jewish brethren

[1] Phil. ii. 20.
[2] 1 Tim. iv. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 22.
[3] 1 Tim. i. 18.
[4] 1 Tim. i. 2.

of Galatia must themselves have wished to urge the young Church to submit to the rules for proselytes and circumcision in order to escape from the strained relations in which they stood with regard to their fellow-believers.

Paul openly taunts them with unwillingness to be persecuted with the cross of Christ. Yet for such a Jew of the Dispersion who believed in the Messiah, it was no light matter to be expelled from the synagogue and left on a precarious footing with the uncircumcised of a strange land. So there was no need here of far-reaching intrigues to introduce a movement in favour of circumcision. Of course there were but few Jews as compared with the great majority of Gentile brethren in the churches, but they were all the more active after their kind. "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump," says the Apostle, who was perfectly right in putting a stop to a propaganda which aimed at making believers in Christ into Jews believing in Christ. The leader of this revolution was apparently an extraordinary character, possessed of great influence; for Paul says that he who troubled them should bear his judgment, whosoever he be.[1]

But the amazing excitability native to the Jewish race was here coupled with the low civilization of the inhabitants of central Asia Minor. Their coarser worship gave them greater satisfaction, and made them feel more assured of divine grace, than did the purely spiritual worship of a true belief. Accustomed from the first to a ritual religion, they found the observance of days and ablutions and fasts a plain necessity if they would enter into the kingdom of the Messiah. The Apostle had immediate opportunity of seeing how spiritual exaltation in the multitude is constantly followed by the longing for something material; how a sojourn in the pure air of the ideal soon rouses a craving after the flesh. The Judaists had reckoned on this, and so Paul sees how those who had begun in the spirit should be perfected in the flesh; how those who had been justified by participation in the spirit, and assured of their entry into the

[1] Gal. v. 10.

kingdom by miracles,[1] felt fuller assurance of their state of grace if they let themselves be marked out by circumcision, if they observed the hours of prayer, the fasts and food-ordinances of Judaism. They were invaded by an inward weariness; they had grown faint;[2] and after running so well, they had ceased to obey the truth.[3]

Yet this is not only the usual course of human affairs. It was above all the regular progress of proselytism, invariably beginning with the Psalms and the pure idea of God, and ending with the knife of circumcision. What happened here was substantially what had already happened in scores of proselyte churches in the East. The beginning was the promises of Israel; the certain end was the law. At the very same time, in the reign of the emperor Claudius, the renewed vitality of Israel had raised up a church of proselytes in Adiabene, headed by the royal family itself. King Izates was on his travels as heir-apparent when he was converted by a Jewish merchant, Ananias; after his accession he kept his Jewish teacher attached to his person. Ananias meanwhile resisted the king's demand for circumcision, wishing to avoid a popular outbreak which would follow such an act of provocation. Then came a Galilean, Rabbi Eleazar, who was urgent with the prince: "O king, unwittingly thou dost sin greatly against the law, and therefore against God. To read the book of the law is not enough; thou must also follow the ordinances contained therein. How long wilt thou remain without circumcision? If thou hast not yet read how it is enjoined, read it forthwith, that thou mayst behold thy guilt." On hearing these words, continues Josephus, he waited no longer, but went into another room and made the surgeon fulfil the ordinance of the law upon himself. Then he told his mother and his teacher Ananias what he had done, and they took counsel over it in great fear and trouble.[4]

Now just as Ananias was here outdone by Rabbi Eleazar, so

[1] Gal. iii. 1—5.
[2] Gal. vi. 9.
[3] Gal. v. 7.
[4] Ant. xx. 2, 2, seq.

in Galatia Paul found himself outdone by men who were reputed "to be more conversant with the law." The Galatians also, after beginning in the spirit, should be perfected in the flesh. Not only observance of Jewish feasts, but actual circumcision, was insisted on to mark their entry into the synagogue. But the Galatian Christians were not dealt with altogether uprightly; they were told they were not thereby bound to obey the whole law.[1] An easier form of Judaism was offered them. They need only calm the storms of the synagogue by official conversion, and at home each could live in his own way.[2]

The line taken by Paul on the first occasion of combating this design on the part of the Galatians, can be seen from those passages in the Epistle to the Galatians where he says he will repeat what he has already said.[3] So during his early stay amongst them, he testified to the churches that whoever took upon himself the burden of life after the law was also bound to keep the whole law,[4] and had no right to profess a milder form of Judaism according to his own pleasure. He pitilessly unmasked the petty motives of those who insisted on circumcision, yet did not themselves keep the law in the privacy of their own home.[5] They only wished to pose before the synagogue as enlargers of the Church of Israel; to appear pleasing in the flesh, and glory in the circumcision of so many Gentiles. Only that they themselves might escape persecution for the cross of Christ were the Gentile Christians to be subjected to an utterly unreal Judaizing.[6] In proportion, therefore, to the hollowness of the religious conviction with which the Apostle found himself confronted, was the eagerness of his attack upon this disingenuous shirking of the cross. He spoke out the truth to the churches, however bitter to hear, however many enemies it made him.[7] In his excitement he did not shrink from the most

[1] Gal. v. 3.
[2] Gal. v. 3, vi. 12—14.
[3] Gal. i. 9, iv. 20, v. 3.
[4] Gal. v. 3.
[5] Gal. vi. 13.
[6] Gal. vi. 11—17.
[7] Gal. iv. 16.

trenchant expressions, crying to the congregation, "If any man preacheth unto you any gospel other than that which ye received, let him be anathema."[1]

On this occasion his energy seems to have struck home. Zeal revived;[2] Jewish righteousness by works was given up once more in favour of simple trust in the grace of Christ. Paul imagined there was no more fear of the churches turning again from the gospel of grace.[3] The old relations were so far restored that Paul was able to set on foot the collection for Jerusalem lately determined upon in the churches of Derbe, Lystra, Iconium and Antioch.[4] So Paul had pushed on from Antioch with Silas and Timothy, believing that he had given a favourable turn to affairs. But he was soon to learn that his strictures rankled in the Church. "So, then, am I become your enemy because I tell you the truth?" he soon complains. "I could wish," he writes, "to be present with you now, and to change my voice, for I am perplexed about you."[5] Involuntarily his memory goes back from his last painful visit to his first stay, which appears in the brightest colours by force of contrast. "Where is, then, that gratulation of yourselves?" he asks sorrowfully. As usually happens in such conflicts, the Galatians are out of humour with him because they think he is out of humour with them. For the end of his strictures is, that he is compelled to assure them that they had done nothing to vex him; he would never forget how once, in the days of his illness, they had received him as an angel and saviour.[6]

The upshot of the visit to Galatia consequently was, that the struggle over the binding value of the Jewish law remained long undetermined; the Apostle was forced to fight it out at one place after another. Strife in Jerusalem, strife in Antioch, strife in Galatia,—such was the course he had traversed. This, perhaps, was the very reason why at this juncture, in the years 53 and 54, the spirit did not suffer Paul to go from Galatia, either

[1] Gal. i. 9. [2] Gal. iv. 18. [3] Gal. i. 6.
[4] Gal. vi. 10. [5] Gal. iv. 16, 20. [6] Gal. iv. 12—20.

westwards to proconsular Asia and Ephesus, where Jewish Christians had appeared already, or northwards to Bithynia, where in the time of Pliny at all events there existed a Christianity strongly tinged with Judaism; but a vision called him over to Europe, where a freer development of his own principles was possible, owing to the looser connection of the Dispersion there with Jerusalem. At all events, we find him driven away from the provinces nearest to Galatia by motives external to himself.[1] But before he took this fateful step into the world of Greeks, he was destined to hear that the attacks of the Judaists upon Galatian Christianity, far from ceasing, were on the verge of success.

It appears from the beginning of the Epistle to the Galatians, that this news reached him almost immediately after his departure from Galatia. As the Galatians are on the point of joining with the synagogue in celebrating the beginning of the Sabbatical year, lasting from Sept. 53 to Sept. 54, the Epistle must date from the autumn of 53, in which Paul crossed into Macedonia.[2] While, then, Paul imagined he had checked the Jewish reaction, he had hardly turned his back before he found it in full activity again. The cause of this rapid change was, that the following of the twelve Apostles had meantime interfered in the affairs of Galatia. In deference to the wishes of the pillars at Jerusalem, the brethren of Galatia were once more forced to conform to the law, as had happened in Antioch, and seemed right to Barnabas whom they knew so well. This time their assistance was brief. A certain proportion of the men submitted to circumcision; life in the church was established on a Jewish footing, and the

[1] Acts xvi. 6, 7.

[2] If, on the one hand, Paul entered Corinth (Acts. xviii. 2) before the death of the emperor Claudius (d. 13 Oct. 54), and, on the other, was in Jerusalem at the beginning of 53 (Gal. ii. 1), his second stay in Galatia falls in the middle of the year 53. Now in Gal. iv. 10, Paul says the Galatians observed years, i.e. the Sabbatical year. Now according to Ant. xiv. 16, 2, and xv. 1, 2, there was a Sabbatical year from Tisri 36 to 37 B.C. Consequently, another fell in Tisri 53 to 54, which proves our chronology.

Jewish calendar of feasts introduced. "Ye observe days and months and years," the Apostle complains; "I am afraid of you, lest by any means I have bestowed labour upon you in vain."[1]

It was a most favourable moment for observing days and months and years. The month of Tisri was doubly sacred on this occasion as the beginning of a Sabbatical year, and without doubt was celebrated by the synagogue with the customary observances. On the seventh and tenth came the Jews' strict fasts; then, too, for the first time the fire on Christian hearths was extinguished.[2] In the middle of the month followed the eight-day feast of tabernacles, which directly recalled the Gentile Saccæa, as the feast of the new moon recalled that of the temple of the moon of Antioch. "At that time," therefore says Paul, "not knowing God, ye were in bondage to them which by nature are no gods: but now that ye have come to know God, how turn ye back again to the weak and beggarly elements whereunto ye desire to be in bondage over again?"[3]

Paul, then, only sees in their return to Judaism a relapse into nature-worship. They once had the spirit, worked miracles, endured sufferings for Jesus:—all in vain, if not indeed to the ruin of their souls. Better to have remained as they were, than afterwards to fall from grace. What difference is there between their former celebration of the full moon in the temple of Men Arkaios, and their present celebration of the new moon after the example of the synagogue? between once joining in the cry of Attis! Attis! in the spring, and now in autumn living in green booths? between their old belief that mutilation, and their new belief that circumcision, was pleasing to God? The principle is the same, whether the knife of the Rabbi or of the priest of Cybele is to purchase the favour of God. So Paul cries in bitter indignation: "I would that they which unsettle you would mutilate themselves."[4] His own estrangement from the Jewish law had

[1] Gal. iv. 8—11.
[2] Ibid.; Levit. xxiii. 23—32; Jos. Ant. iii. 10; 2, 3, 4.
[3] Gal. iv. 9, seq.
[4] Gal. v. 12.

grown to such a pitch, that the ancient practices for which he was once so zealous, he now finds no more sacred than the senseless noise of Cybele and the Galli. An inward freedom this from his own tradition, such as was possessed by no other of his age—freedom for which, experience showed, his century was not yet ripe. He, however, says outright that to him the law is a worship of the elements like nature-worship; and if the Galatians turn back to Judaism, he fears "he shall have bestowed labour upon them in vain." He who once came to them as a Jew, now beseeches them, "Be as I am, brethren, for I am as ye are."

From his point of view, moreover, he found it absolutely impossible to conceive of any such precipitate "fall from grace."[1] As affectionate natures are often blind to the immense difference between their own thought and that of men at large, so he believed that the spirit he had poured out upon the churches of Galatia rested on the same first principles on which he had created his own inward regeneration. That the Galatians felt themselves possessed by the inspiration of the Christian spirit, that they could speak in tongues and work miracles, was certain proof to him of their being made new men by grace. How, then, did they now come to seek in fasting and feasts and circumcision that justification which faith must have given them long since? In his deep humility the Apostle never imagined that their inspiration was the reflex of his own. He regards their backsliding as an enigma. He would conceive of their position as due, not to reason, but to magic. Who has bewitched you? he asks; who has cast spells over you or harmed you with the evil eye? Magic power must lurk in this murmuring of the Jewish Christians; but could they not break this enchantment by looking to him who was openly set forth crucified before their eyes? If he that was crucified, he cries reproachfully, had been truly set before your eyes, no one would have able to seduce you into disobedience to the truth.[2]

While on the one hand, then, he sees a relapse to nature-wor-

[1] Gal. iv. 20, v. 4. [2] Gal. iii. 1.

ship in the new attitude of the Galatians, on the other he cannot conceal from himself that all the developments of Jewish, or, more correctly, Pharisaic life, found their way into Galatia with the service of the law. So far-reaching a revolution in the habits of the Church naturally did not not take place without a sharp contest. Indeed, the law became the watchword for such embittered strife that Paul appeals to the Church in the words of Hillel: "The whole law is fulfilled in one word, even in this: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another." This destruction of the life of the Church was a deep grief to the Apostle already. "Ye were running well," he cries; "who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth? This persuasion came not of him that calleth you. A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. I have confidence to you-ward in the Lord, that ye will be none otherwise minded: but he that troubleth you shall bear his judgment, whosoever he be."

So Paul does not conceal from the Galatians that all the new features of the Church are utterly detestable to him. In a passage remarkable for its subtle distinctions, the Apostle warns them against "all manner of enmities, strife, jealousies, wraths, factions, divisions, heresies, envyings," and so forth. From these warnings we get a complete picture of the feverish activity usual in Jewish churches, whose members lived perpetually at daggers drawn, so that the lictor's rod was often necessary to restore order. This was the exchange Galatia had gained after the entry of Jewish Christianity. But the lower the fall of the Church, the greater its pride. For the lowest grade of religious life is always the boldest in laughing every veil and pretext to scorn; it was not long before the Pharisees' self-sufficiency turned against Paul himself; they refused to recognize his Apostolate any longer. Nothing had wounded the Apostle more deeply than a general denial of his authority to found churches in the name of Jesus. Without sparing spiteful references to his former preaching of circumcision, and his readiness to con-

tinue to preach it where acceptable,[1] his adversaries insinuated that the Apostle was one of those fawning demagogues who profess anything that finds favour with the multitude and increases their following: Paul, they said, had only spoken to them of God's elective grace, not of the law, against his better knowledge and his own former practice. But such persuading of men was worthless; speaking, that is, to please men, not God; in short, pleasing men.[2]

All this did but express the aversion of the Jewish Christians to the accession of a host of Gentiles and contact with the uncircumcised. They were all for themselves and their own prejudices, even though the Church of Jesus should remain within the narrow bounds of the synagogue and never reach the world at large. But these arguments gained force because the Judaists were connected with the leaders in Jerusalem, and deferred to their authority in the same way as one of the founders of the Galatian church, Barnabas himself, had complied with their ordinances. If the real Apostles decided against Paul, his condemnation was pronounced; he had to obey them, for he held his commission from them.

On this view the Galatians would have been able to reject Paul without further ceremony; but it seems that they first sent him messengers to hear his opinion for the last time before taking the final and decisive step;[3] and the way in which Paul bursts out with his first words, "I marvel that ye are so quickly removing unto a different gospel," makes it likely that he seized on the pen to relieve his agitated feelings immediately after receiving the news. To defend his apostolic authority and independence from the decrees of Jerusalem, to vindicate justification by faith as against righteousness by the law, and to avenge the old and the new injuries of the Church by virtue of his office, such was the triple task that Paul set himself and nobly accomplished in his fiery Epistle, which reads like a dithyramb from beginning to end.

[1] Gal. v. 11. [2] Gal. i. 9, 10. [3] Cf. Gal. i. 6, and vi. 17.

"Paul, an apostle not from men, neither through a man, but through Jesus Christ," so runs the greeting of his Epistle, free from all ambiguity. "But if an angel from heaven should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema. As we, Paul, Silas and Timothy, have said to you on our former visit, so say I now again, If any man preacheth unto you any gospel other than that which ye received, let him be anathema." Such was the submission he tendered to their authorities. Is he reproached with flinging wide the doors of the Church to win men?—He can also exclude and excommunicate. Is he accused of hypocritically seeking to please men?—He can also hurl anathemas. "Am I now persuading men or God?" he asks ironically; "or am I seeking to please men?" Indeed, he goes straight to the point, to show that his calling comes directly from Jesus and not from Jerusalem; for he received the gospel, not from a man, nor through the instruction of men, but through revelation of Jesus Christ. Three years he was a Christian in Damascus and Arabia, without so much as setting eyes on one of the Twelve. Again, when he spent fifteen days in Jerusalem, in the year 39, in order to visit Peter, he avows that he saw no other of the leaders except James, the brother of the Lord. Then for fourteen years—and fourteen years are no contemptible portion of a man's life—he lived without any intercourse with them. He was not even known by face to the churches in Judæa. Only when the struggle over circumcision broke out did he go up to the city with Barnabas and the uncircumcised Titus, as he was urged by revelation to bring the question to a decision. On this occasion he laid the gospel which he preached before the Apostles, but not before the majority of those in Jerusalem, to whom the persecutors in Galatia might belong; nor even before the Twelve, but before the most important, those who were reputed to be pillars, James, Peter and John. For the question was not one of receiving charter and seal for the work of converting the Gentiles, but of effecting an understanding, that what he had sowed might not

be rooted up by others, and he be running, or have run, in vain. Then, indeed, the Pharisees in disguise, who became Christians to save the law, demanded the circumcision of Titus; but having these same newly-founded Galatian churches in view, he gave way, no, not for an hour.

So things stood with circumcision. With regard to the rest, those who were of repute imparted nothing to him; on the contrary, they expressly recognized his gift of gaining proselytes. Thereafter, as before, he and Barnabas were to work among the Gentiles, while the others should henceforth preach to the Jews. Then, of course, Barnabas deserted him in Antioch; the blame of which rested with Peter, who attached himself to both sides. Paul clung the more closely to his independence and unvarying honour, as he took Peter to task before the face of all for his illogical position.

None, then, should say that the Apostles were his leaders. "Whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth not man's person: they, I say, imposed nothing on me." Authorities, therefore, decide nothing here. The majority and the desertion of Barnabas are equally indecisive. The question of circumcision will have to be decided upon the fundamental principles of the kingdom of Christ, and on these the decision is made. For in Antioch Paul put this question to Cephas: "If the Jewish law justified us, why should we have become believers? Why was Christ crucified? If justification came by the law, then Christ died in vain."

Paul deals with this important question in the second part of his Epistle. Disregarding all else, he makes his prime appeal to their own religious experience. "This only," he says, "would I learn from you, Did you receive the spirit at your conversion because you fasted and observed hours of prayer, kept holy the Sabbath and the new moon, and were circumcised, or did the spirit come upon you because you believed?" They must deny their own conversion, their past Christian life, if they answered these questions in the affirmative. The God who then gave

C. B. S. E.

them the spirit and worked miracles amongst them, did so before they had heard the Jewish law spoken of. If, then, those first days of salvation were not an empty mockery and delusion, it is proved that salvation comes from faith and not from works. Signs and wonders, he says, still happen amongst us; look then whether they are due to fasting and ordinances about meats, or to hearing the preaching.

Next to their own experience, no example of justification can be so convincing as that of the patriarch Abraham, the father of the righteous, who received the promise for righteousness' sake. Now why was Abraham justified? For his circumcision? But this was only the token of the covenant God made with Abraham because he was righteous. Was it because he kept the law? But the law was not given till 430 years after the promise. No; if Jehovah led forth Abraham under the starry heaven and said to him, "Look up to heaven and count the stars; so shall thy seed be in multitude," it was because Abraham had faith that his old and withered wife would yet bear him a son. It was because Abraham believed that it was counted to him for righteousness. Those, then, are the sons of Abraham who have the promise; not the Israelites after the flesh, but those who are of the like faith. If the Scripture had not these sons of Abraham in view, it would not have said of Abraham's departure from Haran: In thee shall all the nations be blessed; for the Gentiles assuredly have not the law. The promise of salvation to the Gentiles is therefore a fresh proof that justification comes by faith. The faithful will be blessed with the faithful Abraham, and not the followers of the law. These, on the contrary, lie under the curse, as is shown by the Scripture itself. For it says, after the entry into the promised land, six tribes took their stand on the verdant, well-watered Gerizim to proclaim the words of the promise; six on the bare and barren Ebal to utter words of cursing against transgressors of the law. Then the valley of Sichem echoed to the awful curse: "Cursed is every one which continueth not in all things that are written

in the book of the law, to do them."[1] But who can abide by it all, who can fulfil it, so long as he is in the flesh? All, then, who are under the law are also under the curse.

But, says Habakkuk, the righteous shall live by his faith. The law, however, has nothing to do with faith, for it does not say, Believe the commandments, but, Do the commandments. But as no man can really fulfil these commandments, all who hold by the law lie under the curse of Ebal. We, however, have been delivered from the curse by Christ, when he became a curse for us. For it is written in Deut. xxi. 23, so often quoted in scorn by the Pharisees against the followers of him crucified: "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." So Jesus entered into the category of the curse in order that the blessing of Abraham might reach the Gentiles instead of the curse of the law. Should the Judaists rejoin, Yet it is written that the kingdom shall be given to the seed of Abraham, Paul answers, Yes, to the seed, but not to the seeds. It speaks, not of many, but of one, and that one is Christ. Nowhere does it say that all scions of Abraham shall inherit the kingdom, but only the one branch from the house of Jesse. Should it be said again, that although the blessing was promised to Abraham on condition of faith, the law was hereafter to be added as a further condition, the teacher learned in the law makes answer: "If a covenant is once confirmed, the one party cannot make it void nor add to it. So the law which came 430 years later does not annul the covenant which was made on the basis of faith." It follows that the arguments of the Judaists are untenable alike against his exegesis and his concepts of law.

What, then, is the purpose of the law? the Galatians will ask. Surely not to produce blessedness, but to cause transgressions. Therefore it was not given by God, but was ordained through angels by the hand of a mediator. But a mediator always supposes two parties. Yet the Eternal One cannot be a party; being One and All, and not bound by what Moses brought by

[1] Gal. iii. 10, cf. with Deut. xxvii. 26.

mediation between angels and men. Yet it is not as though the law contradicted the promises; we were to be shut up under sin by the law that we might be kept for grace. The law was the gaoler, and sin the prison. We were kept in ward under it, shut up by the law under sin: for if ever our sins ceased, the law said, Thou shalt not covet, and straightway lust returned. So the law was the gaoler who put us back into prison, reminding us that we sit in bonds until the day of redemption, the new birth, the new manhood through the second Adam. Whoever is baptized in Christ, has put on Christ, is one with him, so as to be redeemed. There is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female, but a new creature in Jesus, in him and through him Abraham's seed, and heirs according to promise. Ye cannot therefore become heirs by the way of the law, but by becoming one with the promised sons of Abraham through faith. Then all that is said of him holds good of you.

Now to prove this really true of them, Paul appeals once more to their own knowledge. While in bondage, whether to the law or to nature-worship, we acted under dull compulsion, subject to the elements of the world. But after receiving the sonship through our identity with Christ, we have within us a voice that calls: "Abba, beloved Father!" This emphatic testimony of our religious consciousness assures us of being sons of God; but if sons, then heirs. As, then, he started from an appeal to their own experience at conversion, he also concludes by returning to it. The memory of the cry, "Abba, Father!" uttered by those of them who spoke with tongues, was meant to break like lightning through the encircling fogs of theology after the law. Yet at the close of the dogmatic portion he brings in one more piece of Rabbinical exegesis, revealing the history of the old and the new covenants which underlies the story of Sarah and Hagar. His contemporary Philo saw in Hagar, Greek philosophy, and in Sarah, the Jewish law.[1] The pupil of Gamaliel gave a different interpretation. Hagar, he says, is the

[1] Philo, De Congréssu Quær. Erud. Grat. 427.

law, for Sinai, indeed, is called hahâr; Sarah, the gospel, the barren woman who shall have more children than she that is fruitful. Who, then, would be a son of Hagar, the bondwoman? The very Scriptures guide us from the law to the gospel. So he puts the question to the Judaists of Galatia: "Ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? Howbeit, what saith the Scripture? Cast out the handmaid and her son: for the son of the handmaid shall not inherit with the son of the freewoman. For freedom did Christ set us free; stand fast therefore, and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage."

With this, Paul said all that can be said against the binding power of the law from the point of view that belonging to Christ is based upon a regeneration of human nature. Return to the law would be return to the level we have left, where the flesh is supreme. All that remains for the Apostle is to expose the practical harm introduced along with Pharisaism, to insist on certain virtues which even the Jews might know were not forbidden by the law, and to punish other sins which the present had inherited from the times of sensual idolatry, so as to prevent freedom from the law from being a provocation to the flesh. The actual apology for his Apostolate is, that finally, undisturbed by doubters and adversaries, he directs his apostolic exhortations once more to the church before which he had just appeared to exculpate himself. For the rest, they may spare him their doubts. He has seal and charter for his Apostolate, the marks of Jesus branded on his body. The Galatians know best whence come these tokens.

So at last he stands before us like an ancient general who bares his breast before his mutinous legions, and shows them the scars of the wounds that proclaim him not unworthy to be called Imperator. "From henceforth let no man trouble me; for I bear branded on my body the marks of Jesus." The letter concludes with this reference and the fine words of blessing for Israel:[1] "In Christ neither is circumcision anything nor uncir-

[1] Ps. cxxv. 128.

cumcision, but a new creature. And as many as shall walk by this rule, peace be upon them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God." Stormy and passionate as was his exordium, without a kindly word, the billows are now stilled, and his last word is, "Amen, brethren."

The result of this mighty oration, this "De Corona," can only be gathered indirectly. On the whole, the tide of Judaism was advancing. Yet after this struggle we find Paul again in Galatia in the year 55;[1] and when in 58 he prepared for his last journey up to Jerusalem, Galatia was principally relied upon for the new collection on behalf of the poor in the city.[2] Still it may be said that the victory of a ritualistic religion, first in the Jewish form, then in the Byzantine, and finally in that of Islam, was from the outset only a matter of time among these tribes of Asia Minor. For them, a spiritual religion could only be a transient dream. The languid climate, the pressure of their own sensual nature, and the preponderant power of imagination among Orientals, could not fail soon to corrupt every spiritual religion. This is the reason why Paulinism took such slight root here—perhaps also the reason why Paul himself bade farewell to these provinces, now to be a Greek among the Greeks, after being so long a weakling among weaklings.

[1] Acts xviii. 23.

[2] 1 Cor. xvi. 1.

Fourth Division.

ACTIVITY AMONG THE GREEKS.

ACTIVITY AMONG THE GREEKS.

1. Macedonia.

Visions with Paul generally indicate the passage through a great struggle. Thus the most important step in his missionary life, the crossing over into Europe, was the issue of great inward conflicts. At all events, we read in the Acts, which from the sixteenth chapter on comes nearer and nearer to the account of an eye-witness, of spiritual intimations, forbidding Paul after his seventeen years of work in Asia to preach the word in one place after another. So we find him and his companions in Troas deliberating what is to be done; then a dream summons him across the Ægean Sea. In the dream, we learn from the Acts, a man whose dress proclaimed him a Macedonian, stood before him and called him across the sea with these words: "Come and help us." And they were men Paul found there. There the ancient Church learned the reason why a Macedonian conquered the world, and why the tenacious strength of this tribe became more and more decisive of the fate of the peninsula. Here in the spurs of Hæmus dwelt men of sterner mould than could be found in Asia Minor or languorous Syria. The material was harder to work in, and offered somewhat stubborn resistance; but the work, once done, endured. Thus the Macedonians became the phalanx of Pauline Christianity, his "fellow-soldiers," as he calls them, and whom he loves to address in military phrase.[1] The firmness of character for which the Macedonians became proverbial through centuries of the world's

[1] 1 Thess. v. 8, ii. 2, iv. 1; Phil. i. 13, ii. 25, 30, iii. 12, 16, iv. 3.

history, did not belie them on this occasion. Manliness, loyalty, yet hardness, their characteristics in general history, characterize them equally in the history of the Church. The commonalty was industrious, monarchical, strongly opposed to the instability of the enfeebled political life of Greece;[1] yet with all their prejudices, the noblest and soundest part of the ancient world, and consequently those who offered Christianity at once its fiercest opponents and its most faithful churches. From the first day till the last, the relations between the Apostle and his friends in this quarter remained equally cordial. Here was none of the shuffling and indecision of the Asiatics, none of the irritable vanity and uncertain levity of the Greek communities. They were always true to him, always obedient, always helpful.[2] Needful support in money, which Paul scrupulously avoided elsewhere, he always accepted from the Macedonians on his journeys; for here he was safe from misinterpretation.[3] When weary, old, and a prisoner in Rome, he began to make plans for the evening of his life, the hope arose in him that his Lord would suffer him to return to abide with his Philippians. The Macedonians themselves stand before him like the man in his vision, "putting on the breastplate of faith and love; and for a helmet, the hope of salvation."[4] They are his fellow-soldiers, "who fought with him for the gospel,"[5] who "in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation" of modern Hellenism "were seen as lights in the world, holding the word of life,"[6] whom he exhorts "to stand fast in rank and order,"[7] "to stand fast in one spirit, with one soul striving for the faith, and in nothing affrighted by the adversaries,"[8] as "having the same conflict which they saw in him."[9] They fought, indeed, for a faith that had "become manifest throughout the whole Prætorian guard and to all the

[1] Polyb. iv. 8, 11; Aristot. Polit. v. 8, 6.
[2] Phil. ii. 12, i. 5, iv. 16.
[3] Phil. iv. 10, seq.
[4] 1 Thess. v. 8.
[5] Phil. iii. 3.
[6] Phil. ii. 14.
[7] 1 Thess. v. 14.
[8] Phil. i. 27, seq.
[9] Phil. i. 30.

rest."[1] A distinctive note of confidence runs through these Epistles addressed to Macedonians. One feels throughout that Paul lets himself go freely and without reserve because he is absolutely certain of his people.

Paul, Silas and Timothy, entered the province at Neapolis. They were perhaps joined by a fourth companion from Troas, for the account of the journey in Acts xvi. 9, is given in the first person. It cannot well proceed from Silas or Timothy. The most likely supposition is that it was written by Luke, a physician, according to the Epistle to the Colossians,[2] and a native of Antioch, according to the Fathers.[3] However this may be, we are indebted to the writer for most valuable information. In the first place, he tells how Paul and his companions landed at Neapolis, and made their way thence to Philippi, "which is a city of Macedonia, the first of the district, a Roman colony."[4] Their reason for hurrying from the important mart of Neapolis to the more insignificant military colony in the mountains, was the hope of finding a Jewish church under the shelter of the Roman eagle. As at Antioch, Iconium, Ephesus and Troas the Jews invariably gathered around the Roman barracks, where they knew they were safe from the hatred of the native populations, so a similar church was to be found in the fortress of Philippi. At the same time, Paul was attracted to such places by the fact of being a Roman citizen.

Philippi itself was a semi-Latinized place, which had been granted the *jus Italicum* by Augustus.[5] Hence it may be conjectured that the gospel of the coming of the Son of God was first preached within this Roman fortress, under whose walls the fate of the Roman republic had been decided. "On the Sabbath day," our authority tells us, "we went forth without the gate

[1] Phil. i. 13.

[2] Col. iv. 14.

[3] Hieron. De Script. Eccl. 7; Euseb. iii. 4.

[4] The real capital of the district was Amphipolis, but the title of πρώτη πόλις occurs elsewhere. Eckhel, i. 4, 282.

[5] Dio Cass. li. 4; Plin. Hist. Nat. iv. 18.

by a river side (Gangas), where we supposed there was a place of prayer; and we sat down and spake unto the women which were come together. And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, one that worshipped God, heard us: whose heart the Lord opened, to give heed unto the things which were spoken by Paul. And when she was baptized, and her household, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide there. And she constrained us."

Here is a clear picture of the way in which the first connections were effected, whereby a Lydian woman from Thyatira, herself a stranger, became the first parent of the church in Philippi. We afterwards learn the names of the women who were sitting beside Lydia in the place of prayer when Paul brought them the great tidings. They were Euodia and Syntyche, co-equal founders of the church, though afterwards divided by angry dissension.[1] Among the male members of the church, "whose names are in the book of life," we know nothing further of Syzygus, "the fellow-worker," and Clement, a name of good omen for the church. On the other hand, we find a Philippian Epaphroditus still with Paul in his captivity in Rome, where he had brought Paul gifts of friendship from the Philippians; he is called by Paul his brother and fellow-worker and fellow-soldier.[2]

There is little definite in the account of the journey to determine their length of stay in Philippi; but bonds of friendship such as those between Paul and the Philippians are not established in a few days. In the last year of his life, however, Paul looked back thankfully to all that passed in his first visit. "I thank my God upon all my remembrance of you, always in every supplication of mine on behalf of you all making my supplication with joy, for your fellowship in furtherance of the gospel from the first day unto now; being confident of this very thing, that he which began a good work in you will perfect it

[1] Phil. iv. 2, 3. [2] Phil. ii. 25—30.

until the day of Jesus Christ."[1] It follows that the recollections he carried with him of this sojourn in the house of Lydia were without a tinge of sorrow. Unfortunately, our authority, cut down by the epitomizing hand that has worked over it, only tells of the beginning and end of his visit, and indeed gives as the occasion of his departure, a story which brings before us vividly how the most trustworthy of Orientals have experiences differing greatly from ours according to their own idiosyncrasy and circumstances. "It came to pass," so runs the story, "as we were going to the place of prayer, that a certain maid having a spirit of divination[2] met us, which brought her masters much gain by soothsaying. The same, following after Paul and us, cried out, saying, These men are servants of the Most High God, which proclaim unto you the way of salvation. And this she did for many days. But Paul, being sore troubled, turned and said to the spirit, I charge thee in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her. And it came out that very hour." The re-toucher here suddenly breaks off the thread of the document written in the first person,[3] returning to the third. His only reason for so doing seems to be that he did not find the story of the arrest and miraculous release of the Apostle in his authority, and so thought he ought to complete it in the manner we have before us. According to this account, the owners of the slave-girl raised an outcry at Paul's expulsion of the demon, which destroyed their profits, and accused Paul of spreading a *religio illicita*. In spite of his citizenship, Paul, together with Silas, was given over to the lictor by the duumvirs for punishment, and thereafter imprisoned until he was miraculously set free by an earthquake.

Of all this, Paul himself knows nothing. On his departure from Philippi, he is aware of no such encouragement as he must inevitably have found in the direct interposition of God in his

[1] Phil. i. 3, seq.

[2] *πνεῦμα πύθωνος*: *πύθωνες* in Plutarch are ventriloquists. Def. Orac. 9.

[3] Verse 19.

favour; for then, in 1 Thess. ii. 1, he would not have thought so much of his joy in entering Thessalonica to preach the gospel, "having suffered before and been shamefully entreated at Philippi." They had left the city as men who had been treated with excessive harshness, beaten, perhaps, with rods, although they were Roman citizens. No miracle had taken place; for the Apostle, who thankfully relates the smallest token of divine aid, would never have mentioned the arrogance of men and forgotten the miracle of God which answered it. When he speaks of Philippi, he tells, indeed, of his sufferings and harsh treatment, but never speaks of being released by a miracle. Far from this, he puts it to his credit that he remained cheerful and undismayed even after his deepest shame.[1]

With this conflict, then, the Apostle's visit seems to have come to an involuntary conclusion. But his stay had been sufficiently long and successful for him to establish the most intimate and life-long ties. The position of the church was secured; the true Macedonian spirit of obedience and order was shown at once by the Philippians proceeding to a regular organization, and appointing overseers and helpers (bishops and deacons) to administer the church.[2] One of the first managers, Syzygus, seems to have been entrusted with the chief administration.[3]

Almost every one of the later Epistles attests the intimate care of the Apostle for the fortunes of his Philippians, even when far away from them. Active intercourse, both by letter and in person, furthered the good work "which God began in you."[4] First of all, Silas returned, and Timothy seems to have been employed by preference on the work in Macedonia, especially in Philippi.[5] They, too, for their part, did not lose sight of the Apostle. At his next halting-place, Thessalonica, Paul twice received messengers from Philippi, who brought gifts of money with them on each occasion.[6]

[1] 1 Thess. ii. 2. [2] Phil. i. 1. [3] Phil. iii. 23. [4] Phil. i. 6.
[5] Acts xviii. 5; 2 Cor. i. 1; Phil. ii. 19. [6] Phil. iv. 16.

This, indeed, was the place to which the three Christian brethren took their way after their expulsion from Philippi. Following the great military road, the Via Egnatia, they reached the provincial capital, Amphipolis, on the Strymon, and thence passed through Apollonia to Thessalonica. This road, with its paving of broad stones, was one of the great military roads of history. The legions of Cassius and Brutus had once marched along it to the "field of slaughter." It was possible for Paul and his companions to reach Thessalonica in a four days' march, without halting on the way. Below them lay the blue gulf of Therma, facing the white peaks and hollows of "snow-capped, many-folded Olympus," where the immortals dwelt in the days of Homer.[1] Here was

> "The gate of Heaven, where the Hours kept ward,
> The guardians of Olympus and high heaven,
> To draw the veiling clouds or roll them back."[2]

But the Apostle's first object was not the gods of Greece, but the sons of Jehovah. He passed over the Greek cities of Amphipolis and Apollonia because, in the Apostle's phrase, "the synagogue of the Jews" was not there, but in Thessalonica. This phrase certainly implies that the chief congregation of the Macedonian Jews was here at the seat of the proconsul, undoubtedly attracted by Roman protection and the prospect of traffic. While a single place of prayer sufficed in Philippi, the Macedonian Jews had their officially recognized house of prayer in Thessalonica, which even those who lived without the capital regarded as their centre of worship.[3] Under these circumstances, a wider sphere of action must have opened out before Paul in this city. This, indeed, was what the three messengers of the faith counted on. The word spoken in a place of such importance, re-echoed far and wide. Under Roman dominion Thessalonica had grown into one of the greatest centres of commerce in the Mediterranean, a result in which the Via Egnatia

[1] Iliad, i. 420; xviii. 616, &c. [2] Iliad, v. 749, seq. [3] Acts xvii. 1.

had been a decisive factor. Starting from Dyrrachium, the chief harbour of the Adriatic, this road led through two provinces, and, touching the Ægean at Thessalonica, ran along Thrace. Thus it not only united Asia Minor and Italy, but also the Euxine and the Adriatic. This had practically given Thessalonica such importance as to raise it gradually to be the capital of Macedonia.[1]

Amid the stir and bustle of the great city, Paul knew one way at least, the way to the synagogue. As suited its importance, the court of the proselytes attached to the Jewish school was more considerable than elsewhere, and many women of the city sought, in the observance of the Sabbath and the study of the Jewish books, the edification[2] they could no longer find in hymns to "dædal-throned divine Aphrodite" or "far-darting Apollo." Indeed, it was a current jest here that none who

> "— rose from the waves of Therma's sea,
> Scaled in the misty dawn heaven and Olympus,
> And found almighty Zeus sitting apart
> On the highest crag of many-peaked Olympus,"

where long ago silver-footed Thetis found him, and clasped his knee with her left hand and his chin with her right. Those who climb up it now-a-days, says Cicero, found nothing but ice and snow. At this time, then, the mountain of the gods looked down upon a city where the women sought edification in the Jews' house of prayer, and the men, by Paul's help, were enabled "to turn from idols to serve a living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven."[3] From the Jewish book of the law, whether the Psalms or the prophet Isaiah, Paul proved to the Jews and devout Greeks that the Messiah's suffering and resurrection from the dead had been fore-ordained in the Scripture, while this Messiah was none other than Jesus of Nazareth, whom he preached.

[1] Strabo, vii. 10; Plin. iv. 10; Lucian, Lucius sive Asinus, 46; Appian, Bell. iv. 118.

[2] Acts xvii. 4.

[3] Hom. Il. i. 495, seq.; 1 Thess. i. 9, 10.

Here, again, he met with an often-repeated experience. The proselytes, especially the women, showed more susceptibility than the Jews themselves. True that Paul and his associates found an exception in a Jew named Jason, i.e. Jesus; but the great majority of believers consisted of Greeks, among whom the devout women who had formerly belonged to the synagogue were noticeable for their fervour. In the Acts they are reckoned among the first in the city; but the statement must be accepted with caution; for, according to Paul's own statements, by far the greater number of the converts belonged to the industrial classes,[1] and some to the mercantile class,[2] but not to the great; for throughout his later Epistles he speaks of the "deep poverty" of the Macedonians, and even then most of them lived from hand to mouth, and became a burden on the Church as soon as work ran short.[3]

Among prominent individuals here, besides Jason, the general host, we have the Jew Aristarchus,[4] one of the few from amongst the circumcision who devoted themselves whole-heartedly to the gospel and showed true Macedonian fidelity to the Apostle, whose last captivity was voluntarily shared by Aristarchus. He, too, was the Macedonian afterwards roughly treated by the mob of Ephesus on the occasion of the riot in defence of the temple of Diana.[5] Two others, Secundus and Gaius, are only known as accompanying Paul on his last journey.[6]

For the rest, the church consisted of Gentile Christians, although, as usual, the split with the synagogue did not take place without great storms. Indeed, the Jews of Thessalonica must have displayed exceptional vindictiveness in persecution, for during the next five years we hear of strife and affliction in the church in all the news from Macedonia.[7] The very first shock of meeting appears to have been unusually fierce, for Paul had hardly entered the synagogue before the noise of this war

[1] 1 Thess. iv. 11.
[2] 1 Thess. iv. 6.
[3] 2 Thess. iii. 7, seq.; 2 Cor. viii. 2.
[4] Acts xix. 29.
[5] Acts xx. 4.
[6] 1 Thess. iii. 3; 2 Cor. vii. 5, viii. 2.
[7] 1 Thess. i. 7.

of creeds made the name of Christian[1] known in both the provinces of Macedonia and Achaia at a single stroke. We have seen repeatedly how stormy the proceedings of such assemblies could be; it is therefore not astonishing to find Paul calling these hours of strife a fight such as the horse-breaker or the fighter of wild beasts goes through. But he was never more confident of victory than in these same hours. He takes credit in the church for having waxed bold in his God to speak the gospel in much conflict, though scarcely recovered from the pain and indignity he had suffered at Philippi.[2] And as to-day, maybe, the missionary regards it as a good sign if the word is received from his lips, so, from the first moment of coming forward, Paul recognized that here many were chosen, through the inward freedom and confidence given him in speaking in this great synagogue, through the lofty mood, the perfect cheerfulness of spirit, and the sense of power he enjoyed. In this he traced the presence of the Holy Spirit; he saw, too, that the gospel was not spoken in vain, but entered the heart of the hearers.[3]

Nor was he deceived by this subjective sense. The same "cheerfulness under suffering like Jesus" was shown by the faithful when they "received the word in much affliction, with joy of the Holy Ghost."[4] Spite of all persecution, spite of the yelling mob in front of Jason's door, the new tidings spread happily; for it was received, "not as the word of man, but as it is in truth, the word of God."[5] As such, it produced greater effects upon the soul than was possible for any human word. Soon there was universal astonishment at the reception Paul met with among the mass of Gentiles.[6] Paul prepared for a long stay here, as is clear from the fact that he took up a handicraft. For though he had found a welcome in a Jewish house, he preferred working day and night to being a burden on any

[1] 1 Thess. ii. 2. [2] Ibid. [3] 1 Thess. i. 4, 5.
[4] 1 Thess. i. 6. [5] 1 Thess. i. 6—10, ii. 13.
[6] 1 Thess. i. 8.

one.[1] So it was as a simple craftsman that he preached the gospel in the nightly gatherings at Jason's house.

The First Epistle to the Thessalonians draws a very pleasant picture of the Apostle's relations with his new converts. As he writes, he still sees the church in his mind's eye as when it sat before him:[2] he remembers "how we dealt with each one of you, as a father with his own children, exhorting you and encouraging you, and testifying to the end that you should walk worthily of God, who calleth you into His own kingdom and glory."[3] He dealt with the church "as a nurse cherisheth her own children."[4] "Even so, being affectionately desirous of you, we were well pleased to impart unto you, not the gospel of God only, but also our own souls, because ye were become very dear to us."[5]

Besides the mode of intercourse and the special care of souls undertaken by the Apostle in each individual case, we learn from the same Epistle the substance of the preaching set forth by Paul in the quiet of Jason's house to the congregation fresh from the bustle and noise of the Greek port. Here, again, we see that the gist of the Apostle's preaching is, to all intents and purposes, the announcement of the approaching end of the world. It is the preaching of John once more; the axe is laid to the root of the tree, the Lord stands at the gate and knocks. This it is that spreads its terrors through the suburb of the great mart, as once it dealt a moral shock to the multitudes in the valley of Jordan, and aroused religious revivals. Preaching such as this, which stirred the mind and the imagination to their depths, not only seized upon the masses with astounding force, but must have provoked great struggles, such as Paul tells of.

Now it was a striking coincidence that these tidings of the approaching end came at a moment when the Gentile world had been struck with the same terror. Since the baptism of John,

[1] 1 Thess. ii. 9. [2] 1 Thess. ii. 17. [3] 1 Thess. ii. 11.
[4] 1 Thess. ii. 7, 8. [5] 1 Thess. ii. 8.

no such multitude of terrible portents had been brought together as in the last year of Claudius. The consulate of M. Asinius and M.' Acilius was long celebrated as a year of evil omen. Granted that the caprice of fortune chose that moment for bringing together no little of what usually terrifies the multitude, still the chief responsibility assuredly lies with the anxious temper of the people, passing over into nature and reading in it one dread omen after another, that would else have gone unnoticed. The rule of Agrippina, the adoption of Nero, the declining years of the peace-loving emperor, all cast their gloom over the empire, while marvellous portents announced the approaching wrath of the gods.

A comet stretched its rod of wrath over the sky by night;[1] a shower of blood fell;[2] a swarm of bees settled on the top of the Capitol; all manner of abortions of men and animals—amongst them, a pig with hawk's talons—struck panic into the metropolis; Drusus' monument was struck by lightning; the temple of Jupiter Victor opened of itself. At Nero's coming of age, the sky appeared to be in flames, and an earthquake in the night alarmed Rome and prepared the way for something frightful.[3] These signs and tokens warned the college of haruspices and augurs of an impending change for the worse. The successive deaths of the holders of the five chief offices were equally remarked as a sign of the dispensation of Fate from above.[4] If Dio is right in his statement[5] that Claudius now drove the astrologers out of Italy, we may see in it an attempt to put a stop to the universal anxiety. At the same time, the Jews of Rome also were in a fever of excitement. At the very moment when Paul startled the synagogue of Thessalonica by his tidings

[1] Dio Cass. lx. 35; Suet. Claud. xlvi.; Plin. H. N. ii. 25, 23, 92; Sen. Quæst. Nat. vii. 17, 2.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Dio, in Zonarus upon lx. 32.

[4] Tac. Ann. xii. 64.

[5] In Zonarus on lx. 33. Tacitus has a similar edict of the year 52, Ann. xii. 52. Cf. the individual case in the year 53, Ann. xii. 59.

of the coming Christ, the same announcement roused so fierce a strife in Rome that, according to Suetonius the Jews, according to Dio the congregations that worshipped God, were expelled by the emperor from Italy.[1] In the troubled state of the masses, the Jewish sects, with their obscure whisperings of the impending judgment, perhaps played such a part that the Roman police interfered simultaneously at Rome and at Thessalonica.

However this may be, the Gentile people expected the approaching wrath of the gods exactly as the band of Christians looked for the coming of the day of judgment. It was one of those moments when the nations stand in breathless expectation of what the next hour will bring forth. The Epistle to the Thessalonians on a small scale mirrors forth what was disturbing the world at large. Paul's thought would appear still more closely connected with the state of affairs at the moment if the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, which in its present form cannot possibly emanate from Paul, were genuine at least in its foundation. We should then learn in a specific case how Paul attempted to interpret the signs of the times to his anxious listeners in the house of Jason. Before Christ comes, according to 2 Thess. ii., Antichrist shall appear to desecrate the temple, as was attempted by Caligula. This prince, foretold by Daniel xii. 24, who shall exalt himself against all that is called God, or that is worshipped, shall sit in God's temple and set himself forth as God. The present "occupant" of the throne, Claudius, is not this prince; but lawlessness is already working, and will not cease until he be taken out of the way. Indeed, if we place ourselves at the beginning of the year 54, and consider all that has happened to Claudius, first through Messalina, then through Agrippina, it must be patent to all that the removal of Claudius is only a question of time. Then shall he come who will complete Caligula's act of desecration. Wickedness must first reach its highest pitch; then is the time "of the glorious manifestation

[1] Suet. Claud. xxv.; Dio. lx. 6. The Acts is on the side of Suetonius.

of Christ, who shall slay the Prince of Sin with the breath of his mouth."[1]

If the persecution of the Christians under Nero shows that the authorities of the time have taken cognizance of Christianity, it is equally true that the Christians also busied themselves with the great questions of the time in their own way. The one, indeed, is inconceivable without the other. In Macedonia especially, that land of fate, the expectation of an immediate revolution remained the cardinal thought of the Christian Church, greatly to the prejudice of a peaceful development. As long as Paul remained settled in Thessalonica, all of course went well, for it was not his way to lose sight of the present in the prospect of impending destruction. We see instead from his Epistle how here once more he took the keenest personal interest in his care of souls.[2] He had before him a church gathered together from Jews, proselytes and Greeks, noble women and the humbler classes. All were infected to a greater or less degree with the taint of city life, which was inconceivably immoral in great sea-ports such as this. To unfold the glorious laws of the divine kingdom against this sombre background, was a task for Paul's eloquence enthusiastically undertaken. When the time came for him to depart from his church, he knew in his heart that they had received the word, "not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God."[3]

But the fanaticism of the Jews did not long endure the presence of the preachers in the city. Once convinced of the pernicious character of the new doctrine, they had no difficulty

[1] The first to refer 2 Thess. ii. 2 to Caligula was Hugo Grotius. The first to understand the emperor Claudius under the κατέχων of verse 7 was Whitby (Paraphrase and Commentary on the New Test., London, 1718, ii. 470). Döllinger (Christenth. u. Kirche z. Z. ihrer Grundlegung, p. 288) also refers the κατέχων to Claudius, as one who occupies the throne for a time, κατέχει, while Hitzig (Gesch. Isr. 583) sees in it a play upon words; ὁ κατέχων, qui claudit = Claudius.

[2] 1 Thess. ii. 12.

[3] 1 Thess. ii. 13.

in egging on the rabble against Jason's house. Fortunately, Paul was away when several riotous mobs, filling the streets with their uproar, dragged Jason and others from their houses, and haled them before the politarchs on the charge of causing the same disturbances with their preaching here as had been caused by the Christians in Rome and every other city of the Jewish Dispersion.[1] The strangers were further charged with assailing Claudius Cæsar by their tidings of the coming Messiah. The politarchs, solicitous for the reputation of their free city,[2] were seized with great consternation. For this charge was a most serious matter in a time of extraordinary ferment; at a moment, indeed, when everything spoke of attempts upon the life of the emperor, who was actually murdered in the following year; when Claudius himself struck at the Jews of Rome; when, for the first time, the tribunals of the capital had taken cognizance of the tidings of the coming king of the Jews and adopted sharp measures of repression.

In the end, Jason and the rest were set at liberty, after giving security that Paul and Silas would leave Thessalonica immediately. This mode of dealing with the case may possibly have been simply in conformity with the imperial edict; but the expulsion was, generally speaking, one of the most ordinary measures of these cantonal administrations, as the Apostle was to have ample experience in later days. "We are made as the filth of the world, the offscouring of all things, even until now," he writes in Ephesus a few years later.[3] So here the rulers of the free city expelled him from within the walls. The brethren conveyed Paul and Silas out of the city under cover of night, to travel once more along the Via Egnatia. Paul was very loth to go, for promising as was the position of the new church, it was long before he thought it so well established that it could be left to its own development.

Moreover, he perceived that an impression had been made on the whole of Macedonia and Achaia by the peculiar events in

[1] Acts xvii. 8. [2] Plin. iv. 10. [3] 1 Cor. iv. 13.

Thessalonica. So he stayed for the present at Berœa, twelve miles off; here he could try fresh missionary work while still keeping watch over Thessalonica. His reception in the synagogue of Berœa was unexpectedly favourable. The Jews discussed his proofs from Scripture; while among the proselytes of the better sort, especially some Greek women of high birth, Paul found unhoped-for sympathy. While he was still hesitating whether to return to Thessalonica or not,[1] his adversaries there discovered his new resting-place, and he was harried out of Berœa by a riot in the synagogue instigated by them. He now thought it more prudent to put a greater distance between himself and his adversaries. His new friends conducted him to the nearest port on the Thermaic Gulf, whence Paul took ship to Athens.

At Athens, distant three days' sail along the coast, Paul met Timothy.[2] He was still undecided whether it was not his duty to return to the battle-field he had left; but the personal rancour of his adversaries was too great for him to venture upon open opposition. "We would fain have come unto you," he writes, "again and again; and Satan hindered us."[3] Hearing once more of troubles there, he could not endure to remain without news, and so made up his mind, as he puts it in 1 Thess. iii. 1, to stay alone in Athens, and send Timothy, who was not forbidden the precincts of the town, back to Thessalonica, for he feared lest the tempter had tempted the church to its destruction. Timothy was to see that the church remained firm and of good cheer, and to prevent any one from being dismayed by these afflictions; for indeed the oppression of the faithful was but one of the tokens of the latter days. Hereunto was the church appointed; and Paul, too, had spoken of these afflictions from the first. So now the company which had once set out from Derbe was broken up. Silas had stayed behind in Macedonia, but had gone to Philippi, being interdicted from Thessa-

[1] 1 Thess. ii. 17. [2] 1 Thess. ii. 17, iii. 1, against Acts xvii. 14.
[3] 1 Thess. ii. 18.

lonica,[1] while Timothy was working in Thessalonica. Of Luke, on the other hand, we must assume that he had already returned from Philippi to Troas, unless he stayed for a while at Philippi, the place from which the Acts afterwards resumes its account in the first person.

Meanwhile, the centre of Christianity in the province of Macedonia lay in the three churches of PHILIPPI, THESSALONICA and BERŒA, which had been established alongside the corresponding Jewish synagogues. We know least about the church of BERŒA, yet it appears to have reckoned more Jewish members than any other church founded by Paul.[2] We know by name only Sopater, son of Pyrrhus,[3] who conducted Paul on his last journey from Corinth to Asia Minor, and represents the share of Berœa in the charitable work for Jerusalem. On the other hand, the fortunes of the church in THESSALONICA can be followed in greater detail. Stirred by the news he received from Timothy, Paul addressed an epistle to the church in the year 54, giving us various information about the state of affairs in the place.

What had become needful here was, on the whole, an epistle of encouragement. Hardly had Paul quitted Thessalonica before the church found itself beset by those of the same nationality who assured them that they had fallen victims to the guile of a hypocrite. When a man appeared, like Paul, as the preacher of a strange worship in the Greek cities, a man clad in the humble dress of a Cilician weaver, which hardly covered his nakedness, much less protected him against the vicissitudes of the season,[4] he must submit to being classed with the hosts of Chaldæans, magicians, priests of Mithra, Egyptian conjurors, and other sanctimonious cheats in holy guise, who at this time

[1] Cf. 2 Cor. xi. 9 with Acts xviii. 5 and Phil. iv. 15.

[2] Acts xvii. 11.

[3] Acts xx. 4; not the one in Rom. xvi. 21, who is a Corinthian and a Jew.

[4] 1 Cor. iv. 11.

lived upon the reverence of the West for the East. He appeared "as though he would preach new gods." Whether it was delusion or avarice or love of position, whether secret motives hereafter to be revealed, or maybe impure desires, that had led the insignificant Paul, the imposing Silas and the youthful Timothy, to insinuate themselves into the good graces of men and women of Thessalonica, the well-meaning friends of the converts did not care to decide; one thing at least was clear to them—these believers had been outrageously duped.[1]

This state of affairs appears, from the second chapter of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, virtually a dialogue with those members of the church who had been worked upon by the insinuations of their friends and relations. Nothing but the existence of such charges can explain why the Apostle particularly asseverates in his Epistle that he believed he had shown his preaching was not a frenzy, to be cooled down by imprisonment and the lictor's rod, nor uncleanness, with its insinuating flattery, nor dissembled covetousness, which snatches at the purse under the cloak of religion, nor, again, the veiled advances of designing intrigue. No; he had shown that, being thought worthy of the gospel by God, he preached under this high compulsion, and cared nothing for his own profit nor what was pleasing to men. The Thessalonians, indeed, knew well that he had not flattered himself into the good graces of any one, nor desired money from any. Nor was pride his failing. He was not eager for honour from them, nor from others, to gain importance in their eyes. He had never given himself airs nor demanded honour from any, as was known to them who found him at work day and night plying his miserable trade. Nay, then, against all slander and abuse he could appeal to their witness and God's to prove that in those days he and Silas and the youthful Timothy appeared in a very different light from that in which they were now represented. Their only objects had

[1] 1 Thess. ii. 1—12.

been work and peace and virtue; and the Apostle's defence concludes with the maxim: Judge of our intentions from your opinion of us.[1]

As things were, the impression left by the Apostle's pure and lofty character was too recent to allow these suspicions to triumph. The Apostle therefore delivers his exculpation without the excitement usually characteristic of his defence, secure in the sense that these charges are too petty even to sully the hem of his garment. Besides, long before he undertook his defence, the church had decided in his favour. But it was precisely this loyal faith which fanned the anger of the Macedonian citizens, so that it was not long before the opposition of the synagogue was reinforced by equal resistance on the part of the Gentile families concerned. Paul is soon forced to lament that the Thessalonians are exposed to as violent persecution from their fellow-countrymen as the churches of Judæa from the Jews, or himself in Corinth from those of his own nation.[2] In what this persecution consisted is not mentioned. It can scarcely have reached such a pitch of ill-treatment as in Judæa, for then there could hardly fail to be traces of bloodshed in our Epistle. But it may be imagined that the hatred of the synagogue, which did not scruple to track the Apostle down to Berœa, was still less inclined to let his following abide at home with them in Thessalonica. The citizens, too, were not such as to forget to-morrow what they had clamoured against yesterday. When, four years later, Paul does but visit the city, the old hatred of his enemies flares up again. "For even when we were come into Macedonia," he writes in the year 58, "our flesh had no relief, but we were afflicted on every side; without were fightings, within were fears."[3] Thus the church was, and remained, in a state of oppression. But the very opposition intensified the glow of religious conviction. It gave rise, indeed, to a certain over-excitement in the piety of the church. In breathless expectation of the last judgment, indubitably stirred

[1] 1 Thess. ii. 1—12. [2] 1 Thess. ii. 14—16. [3] 2 Cor. vii. 5.

again and again by the succession of terrible omens, their entire temperament elevated by persecution from without, the Thessalonians had fallen into a state of excitement bordering on intoxication. Paul regrets to hear that the church is making calculations over the time and hour of the advent, discussing the how and where, and generally showing a disposition to quit the course of their ordinary avocations. For Timothy had pointed out, as the greatest error of the Christians there, a mistaken excitement in spiritual things, which distracted them from their duties of labour as citizens. Every one was concerned about his neighbour's salvation; all, with the best intentions, meddled in affairs which were no business of their own; one and all gave themselves up to a noisy, clamorous activity, which harmed them in their private affairs and diverted their public interests. The natural consequence was disorder in the congregations of the church. If they were driven to combine in view of persecution, they allowed the bolder spirits entire freedom of prophecy when permission had better been refused; but turned away from the timorous and irresolute, instead of giving them confidence and security. Some, self-deluded, took the wild fancies of their imagination for the communion of the Spirit; while others, consciously or unconsciously, accepted the preaching of the last judgment in order to be relieved of the necessity of labour, and let themselves be supported by the wealthy.[1] The more intelligent must not be blamed for attempting to quench this enthusiasm entirely, and holding prophecy as of little value in itself without further proof. This is implied in the Apostle's warning: "Quench not the spirit; despise not prophesyings; prove all things; hold fast that which is good."[2]

But conflicts could not fail to arise in the congregations between these opposing tendencies to intoxication and sobriety. The rulers of the church appointed by Paul were not always able to maintain order and tranquillity between forces so diametrically opposed. At last, indeed, we hear much of distress,

[1] 1 Thess. iv. 12. [2] 1 Thess. v. 19.

depression, and a general disposition to succumb to melancholy. Despondency, the regular attendant of religious over-excitement, seized upon many who had formerly been of good cheer. At the same time, they were a great trouble to their rulers; for the Apostle knows well how great measure of patience this disorder claims, and how hard it is to endure this unending, spiritless lamentation. Still, he bids the rulers to keep the weak from sinking, to cheer the faint-hearted, and be long-suffering towards all men.[1] For themselves, he cries to them: "Rejoice alway; pray without ceasing; in everything give thanks; for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus to you-wards."[2]

One thing, however, beyond all troubled these distressed spirits, and must even have exercised the more confident among the Christians. Since the gathering of the church to await the day of the King's advent, several deaths had occurred within its circle, and had put to shame the hope of these prematurely departed sisters and brethren. The promises of the Apostle thus seemed falsified. All had joined him in hope of inheriting the kingdom to come. If some were deceived, what guarantee had the rest? Here was the first whisper of doubt in the Lord's advent that entered the Church and instantly divided the brethren, till in later generations the mocking question was often put: "Where is the promise of his coming? For from the days that the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation."[3] They had not got as far as this yet, but at all events there was a sense of dissatisfaction with the non-fulfilment of the promise to the departed brethren. In any case, one part of their joy was taken from them. Brothers and sisters, husbands and wives, had looked forward to bearing palms and singing songs to the Lamb together in the kingdom of the Messiah, robed in white; of this joy they were cheated. Death then laid a question before the Church for faith to answer.

Paul, however, does not enter upon this question of the last

[1] 1 Thess. v. 12—16. [2] 1 Thess. v. 17, 18.

[3] 2 Pet. iii. 4, 5; 1 Thess. v. 3.

things without first severely rebuking the state of excitement among the Macedonians. He begins by exhorting them to abstain from mistaken purposes and occupy themselves with their handicrafts, thus introducing his discussion of the last things with grave reference to existing duties: "We exhort you, brethren, that ye abound more and more; and that ye study to be quiet, and to do your own business, and to work with your hands, even as we charged you; that ye may walk honestly toward them that are without and may have need of nothing." In the same way he concludes his reflections with the impressive exhortation to be sober and watchful, instead of intoxicating themselves with a kind of inspiration which unfits them to fulfil their immediate duties. For the sons of the day must keep watch like soldiers, with sobriety and vigilance.

Thus introduced, and involved in strong appeals to the military and combative temper of his Macedonians, the answer follows to the questions that have caused so many tears and dreams. It was an answer derived from tradition and his own mystical conception of the Christian's unity with Christ. The mere fact, Paul thinks, of happening to be alive or dead at the parusia, has no effect upon our share in the kingdom. The life begun in us through Christ is not affected, whether the advent finds us walking upon earth or sleeping in the earth, for we are one with him. At his appearance, therefore, our life will re-appear.

The mode in which this will happen is described by the Apostle according to a saying of the Lord unknown to us: "that we that are alive, that are left unto the coming of the Lord, shall in no wise precede them that are fallen asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we that are alive, that are left, shall together with them be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words."[1] There is

[1] 1 Thess. iv. 15—18.

thus no hesitation in the Apostle's hope that he and those who still live will behold the day of the Lord. Nor is he assailed by any doubt that he will live until the day of the Lord, when he will point to the Church he brings to the Lord as his joy and crown of glory. But though some should be buried in the grave before Jesus comes, they shall lose nothing by it, for they will return at the call of the trumpet. "Wherefore exhort one another, and build each other up, even as also ye do."

With this, Paul quits Macedonian affairs for a while; we only get news from this quarter when, four years later in the autumn of 58, he wrote his Second Epistle to the Corinthians from one of the Macedonian churches.[1] But his intercourse with Macedonia had not ceased meanwhile. In particular, we find Timothy busy in Macedonia, where he seems to have spent nearly all these years of his ministry of the gospel. When, early in 58, Paul was forced to flee from Ephesus, we find him immediately among his beloved Macedonians. Here there is still agitation, both within and without; but the Apostle cannot find words to express the friendliness and good-will he met with among his old friends. He compares his journey through the province to a triumphal march. As such festal processions move along amid clouds of incense and goodly odours, so in his case the knowledge of God is the sweet savour left in every place he visits.[2]

Another fine trait in these Macedonian Christians is the warm-heartedness so conspicuous on this occasion. In the Epistle to them, Paul had already praised the church of the Thessalonians for being ready to come forward in support of all poor Christians in the province;[3] he might now write the same of all Macedonians. In spite of their deep poverty and the various forms of distress they laboured under themselves, they laid a formal levy upon themselves for the collection at this time set on foot by Paul for the poor of Jerusalem. "According

[1] To be exact, chapters i.—ix. of it. See below.

[2] 2 Cor. ii. 14, seq. [3] 1 Thess. iv. 10.

to their power," so runs the testimony of the Apostle, "yea, and beyond their power, they gave of their own accord, beseeching us with much intreaty in regard of this grace and the fellowship in the ministering to the saints: and this, not as we had hoped, but first they gave their own selves to the Lord, and to us by the will of God."[1] The latter words probably refer to the fact that all Macedonians were ready to put themselves at the disposal of the Apostle, and even, if necessary, to escort him to Jerusalem. Two of them also went with Titus at this time to Corinth, to relieve the Apostle of the trouble of collecting. Others accompanied him when he followed Titus in person at the end of 58. These are perhaps the same brethren who, according to the Acts,[2] accompanied Paul back to Macedonia and then on to Asia, namely, Sopater of Berœa, and Aristarchus and Secundus of Thessalonica.

The development of the church in PHILIPPI can be traced back somewhat further than at Thessalonica, for the Epistle to the Philippians was written when Paul was in captivity, since in Phil. i. 13 he speaks of his bonds. We have, therefore, to deal with one of the Apostle's last documents. Ten years have passed, but the situation is little changed. The Church's struggle for existence is not yet concluded. Paganism still strives to terrify the little band, which has been "granted in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer on his behalf," fighting the same fight which Paul finds going on in Rome.[3] But this protracted struggle was actually a school of faith and strength for the stalwart nation. After so long intercourse and so many vicissitudes, the Apostle is able to acknowledge their zeal to be the same as on the first day.[4] For as they had stood firmly by him from the beginning, so they had not forgotten him when he was led away to Rome. Nor was it only in their prayers that they thought of him who went to meet a dreadful fate in Rome in support of the gospel;[5] they sent one

[1] 2 Cor. viii. 1—5. [2] Acts xx. 4. [3] Phil. i. 27—30.
[4] Ibid. [5] Phil. i. 19.

of their number, Epaphroditus, to the capital, to relieve the burden of captivity with their gifts. Even at Cæsarea they would gladly have sent him the means of support; but as before, in the year 58, when we hear of their deep poverty, so in the interval "the unfavourable season" did not permit them to collect a sufficient sum. It was only in the latter year that their position improved.[1] In the meanwhile, however, intercourse by letter had not ceased.[2]

According to one statement of the Apostle, this correspondence must have referred to the question to which by degrees all his letters were directed, namely, to the tide of Judaism which was rising in the Christian churches with the rise of the national movement among the Jews. To the false brethren who had crept in at Antioch, the makers of trouble in Galatia, the lying apostles of Corinth, Paul has now to add certain in Philippi, whom he calls dogs, evil-workers, ministers of the concision. As the new-comers in Galatia sought to make Jews of the Christians in order to be spared the cross of Christ, i.e. persecution of the synagogue, so now they continued to act as enemies of the cross. As in Corinth they had consulted their own convenience, yet managed to pose as zealots for the law, so in Philippi their belly is their god and circumcision their glory. They still look for an earthly Jerusalem and a Jewish king as Messiah, while the Christian city is in heaven and not bound to the soil of Palestine.

Their power and influence, indeed, gained ground. Now, as so often before, the Apostle speaks of it with tears.[3] Wherever they found entrance, there was an end to the peace of the church. Thus the period of unity is over on the banks of the Gangas; two of the women, Euodia and Syntyche, who had once fought loyally beside the Apostle and Lydia, Clemens and Syzygus, and the rest of the founders of the Church whose names are in the book of life, were now in bitter enmity, so that the Apostle is compelled to beseech Syzygus to help them. Of

[1] Phil. iv. 10. [2] Phil. iii. 7. [3] Phil. iii. 18—20.

course, the struggle is more than a women's quarrel. It injured the whole Church; and the Apostle exhorts them, in moving words: "If there is any comfort in Christ, if any consolation of love, if any tender mercies and compassions, fulfil ye my joy, that ye be of the same mind, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind." He implores them to do nothing through faction or vainglory,[1] to obey the gospel without murmuring or hesitation; and as they have always been obedient, so during his absence to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling.[2] Something of what was beloved or prized by himself and the Church had thus deteriorated; but, taken as a whole, this is indeed the pearl among his churches, "his joy and crown." As once he wrote to his friends at Thessalonica that they would be his crown of glory on the day of Christ's coming, so in the evening of his life he utters to the Philippians his hope of being free once more, and dwelling and abiding with them until the day of the Lord.[3]

---

2. Achaia.

Paul had quitted the cities of Macedonia, firm in their ancient belief, for one of the centres of higher culture, which had advanced far beyond the provincial level of faith. Here in Athens no one was assailed for bringing forward something new to hear and discuss. If he brought forward new gods, so much the better. Athens, notwithstanding its brilliance and size, was simply the great school of sophists, as depicted in the Acts.[4] All trade in native or manufactured products had long ceased. The Piræus had fallen into decay; the harbour was silted up; even the old artistic crafts were gone. Instead, the place was thronged with professors, philosophers, rhetoricians, pedagogues, gymnasiarchs and trainers of youth of every sort

[1] Phil. ii. 1—4. [2] Phil. ii. 12. [3] Phil. i. 25.

[4] Cf. Pausan. i. 2—31; Philostr. Apollon. iv. 17—22.

and kind. Young men came from distant countries with their tutors, their educated slaves, their fencing-masters and riding-masters. It was characteristic of the city not to date the year by the consuls at Rome or the local archons, but by the presidents of the university, the cosmetæ. But however sedulous the endeavour to live in the reflected glory of past times, the utter degeneration of Greek philosophy was as glaringly visible here as at Tarsus or Alexandria. Here, too, they made themselves drunk on water, in the happy phrase of the magician of Tyana; and of intrigue and quarrelling there was no end. Granted that the activity of the ancient schools had been little edifying, it now assumed an almost comic cast under the iron rule of Rome. The sophist maintained the figment of bygone importance, yet, if a Roman aristocrat deigned to attend his course, would kiss the hem of his toga. Not only were these men of might adorned with the titles of Choregus and Agonothete, but the benefactors of the great schools had numerous busts and statues placed on the Acropolis, while authority was literally deified. Even Bernice, the licentious daughter of Herod Agrippa I., was honoured with one of these statues on the motion of the Areopagus.[1] The favours with which the politicians of the capital repaid these servile offices of fallen Athens, scarcely veiled the lofty irony with which the Roman bureaucracy looked upon the whole affair.[2] Thus Athens enjoyed a traditional supremacy, the hollowness of which was known to every one.

Such was the city visited by Paul in the year 54. Philostratus gives us a lively picture of affairs there in his parody of the Acts, where he makes his heathen prophet go to Athens at the very date of Paul's visit.[3] "Apollonius," he says, "on entering the Piræus, went up direct from his ship to the city. On the way he kept on meeting philosophers going down to Phalerum.

[1] Corpus Inscr. Gr. No. 361.

[2] The strongest instances of the kind are Piso's ineptitudes towards the Athenians. Tac. Ann. ii. 55.

[3] According to the date implied, Apollon. iv. 24.

Some of them had taken off their coats and were sunning themselves, for autumn in Athens is very sunny; some were buried in books; others were engaged in conversation or discussion. But not one of them passed him by; all gave him to understand that they knew him, turned back with him, and gave him friendly greeting."[1]

Propertius also found Athens in the early days of the Roman empire such as it appears to this later visitor:

> "With Plato's lore my mind I'll there improve,
> Or in sage Epicurus' gardens rove;
> Learn rhetoric, rapier of Demosthenes,
> The while Menander's Attic salt shall please,
> Or many a picture fair enchain the eye,
> Or statues wrought in bronze or ivory."[2]

The sketch of the Apostle's stay in Athens drawn in the Acts can be understood from this picture of life in the city. The contrast between the poor Jewish weaver and the Greek scholastic wisdom is brought into high relief by making him mingle with the strangers hurrying to and fro in the agora of the Ceramicus and its halls.[3] Here stood Ptolemy's gymnasium and the Stoa Pœcile, which gave their name to the Stoics. So Paul fell into discussion with followers of the Porch and of Epicurus, which soon attracted others. "Now all the Athenians," says the Acts pointedly, "and the strangers sojourning there spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell or to hear some new thing."[4] After this, Paul found his way to the Areopagus, where he proceeds to speak upon the inscription on an altar, "To the unknown God." Inscriptions of this kind were to be found in Athens.[5] When Epimenides, in his character of atoning priest, purified Athens from blood-guiltiness and pestilence, he erected altars with similar inscriptions.[6] The

[1] Philostr. Apollon. iv. 17.
[2] Prop. Eleg. iii. 22, 24, seq.
[3] Acts xvii. 17.
[4] Acts xvii. 21.
[5] Pausan. i. 1, 4; v. 14, 6; Philostr. Apollon. vi. 3.
[6] Diog. Laert. v.; Epimen. i.

intention of the inscription was parallel to the Roman custom of invoking no particular deity when sacrifice was made after an earthquake, but sacrificing with the words: Si deo, si deæ.[1] Paul, the narrative of the Acts proceeds, took this God to mean the One and All-embracing whom he had come to preach to the men of Athens.

No one who had read the Pauline Epistles will contend that the speech offered us on this occasion is not entirely the composition of the historian. Further, the preceding dispute in the market-place is little in harmony with the general habits of the Apostle, and the place of his address to the Athenians is utterly ill-chosen, for the Areopagus was a law-court, not a forum with a tribune, as the author of the Acts seems to suppose. Again, to leave the agora for the space before the Areopagus, Mars' Hill, would be remarkable in the extreme for the object of a public speech. The whole representation must therefore be regarded as a free invention. What is true in this composition is not only the fundamental thought that Christianity would make the least headway where truth had become the subject of daily controversy in the schools, and that windy sophists are the last on whom the true necessities of the human heart are likely to dawn, but the whole presentation is, further, a notable testimony that in the second century the Acts had no cause for peculiar satisfaction with the attitude of the Athenians towards the cause of Jesus. Other historical significance this composition has none, for all the grandeur of its conception. Paul was no orator of the market-place. He had not come to bring owls to Athens. This is why we must not look for the Apostle on the Areopagus before aristocratic judges, nor in the agora of the Ceramicus before the disciples of the Stoa Pœcile. At Philippi, he taught in the house of Lydia; at Thessalonica, he settled in Jason's cottage; at Corinth, we find him in Aquila's weaver's shop, while carrying on his teaching in the Jewish quarter in the house of Titius Justus. So, too, in Athens he

[1] Preller, Röm. Mythologie, 55.

would surely not have gone to the famous centres of culture, but to the unknown streets occupied by those of his own faith. If Paul worked for his gospel in Athens, we should look for him in the synagogue, as is stated by the Acts soon after. But at Athens, in other respects so thoroughly investigated, with not a stone of its foundations left unturned by scholars, not a single certain trace of a Jewish house of prayer can be discovered. Paul himself nowhere speaks of working in Athens. He gives the Thessalonians to understand that to be left alone in Athens was not his own inclination, but a sacrifice offered to the Thessalonians. Yet the Acts can give us the names of two Athenian Christians, Dionysius the Areopagite,[1] and a woman named Damaris. It may be that Dionysius' surname, which marks him as an inhabitant of Mars' Hill, gave rise to the whole legend of Paul's advancing the cause of Jesus on the Areopagus; just as Tiberius himself is made to champion it in the Roman Senate, and Peter, according to the Acts' own representation, in the Jewish Sanhedrin. Later writers were greatly concerned with the figure of this noble Christian, Dionysius the Areopagite,[2] whose name served on the title-page of an entire series of Neoplatonic theology. But whatever the facts are about Dionysius and his Athenian church, the latter cannot in any case have been considerable; for Paul never mentions it, and never visits it on the three occasions of passing through the town, nor is there the slightest reference to it anywhere else.[3] We find Christian churches spreading rapidly over Achaia, not from the haughty city of Athens, but from the busy manufacturing town of Corinth.

The phenomena, indeed, we meet with here remind us strongly of the fact that in a certain sense the aspect of Athens was that of later Hellenism. "Their mouth," says Josephus of the Greeks,

[1] Also Eusebius, iv. 24, after older authorities. Dionysius of Corinth in the second century.

[2] Euseb. iv. 2.

[3] Its name could hardly fail to appear in the collection, if it existed.

"is always open and their tongues loosened for controversy and speech; but serious work they leave to others." At bottom, too, this is Paul's experience. Throughout Greece we see a sudden rush to the new gospel. Without a moment's delay the people enter the organization of the new Church and seek to make themselves conspicuous in it. A propaganda develops with a rapidity that almost appears out of keeping with the slowness of intercourse.[1] Every problem embraced in the new doctrine is taken up, discussed and developed. There are frequent meetings, much talk, and a good deal of heat over matters of opinion and all kinds of personal ambitions. But there is no genuine earnestness in placing themselves and their own lives under the discipline of the gospel. To the Greek, the new doctrine is entirely an object of rhetoric, speculation and social experiment. For himself, he is all too ready to maintain every gross habit of Greece, and takes it very ill when the exponents of the new religion press him with its practical requirements. Among the Macedonian churches these traits are hinted at in Thessalonica. This is so to a far higher degree with Corinth. It is very characteristic that, whereas Paul in his introductions to the Epistles to other churches usually expresses his thanks for very different things, in the case of the Corinthians he glories that they have been enriched in all utterance and all knowledge, and fall short in no gift.[2]

The fact that Paul left Athens so soon for Corinth, where he met Silas and Timothy again, must only be regarded as an example of his unbroken practice of going, not from city to city, but from synagogue to synagogue. Now the chief synagogue of Achaia, as elsewhere, stood in the proconsul's seat of government.

We see the Apostle, then, upon the frequented road leading over the isthmus to Corinth through the famous pine-forests of Poseidon. The isthmus of Corinth consists of a very low neck of land, to which the mountain ridges slope down from N.E. and

[1] 1 Thess. i. 7. [2] 1 Cor. i. 5.

S.W. In its narrowest measurement it is 40 stades, according to the ancients, i.e. 5 miles, but more exactly only 18,200 feet. This part was unusually frequented; goods and cargoes of every description were continually being transported between the harbours of Schœnus and Cenchreæ on the Saronic Gulf, and Lechæum and Corinth on the other side. Even entire ships, cargo and all, were put on rollers at the narrowest place between Schœnus and Lechæum, and dragged over the isthmus.[1]

Through this busy traffic lay the Apostle's road to Corinth. Far off, the Acrocorinthus comes into sight, the highest mountain of the neck of land on which stood the old town and the famous temple of Venus. This was the peak, washed by the sea and kissed by the sun, where Apollo and Helios, in the old myth, fought till victory declared for Helios. He, however, gave up the sunny heights to Aphrodite, whose temple afterwards crowned the summit of the mountain. Thus commerce and love made up the genius of the place.

The city, spread out in an oblong form, stood where the mountain falls away steeply on the north.[2] But the city which Paul visited was not the "blest city" sung by Pindar, any more than it was the ancient capital of the Doric states and the Achæan league described by Thucydides. The old trading city, with its splendid buildings, its temples and its renown, was swept off the face of the earth in 146 by Lucius Mummius. For about a century Corinth was a heap of ruins, a wretched village. Only the old town and a few temples had survived the Roman destruction.[3] But in 46 B.C., a century again before the coming of the Apostle, Julius Cæsar, while dictator, resolved to rebuild the city. He owed it, he declared, to the goddess Venus, the ancestress of the Julii, whose favourite he had always been. With his usual promptitude he speedily re-established the place and peopled it with veterans and sons of freedmen.[4] Splendid

[1] Strabo, viii. 6. [2] Strabo, l. c., according to his visit in person.
[3] Strabo, viii. 6, xxii. 23.
[4] Strabo, l. c.; Pausan. ii. 1, 2; Plutarch, Cæs. 57; Pliny, Hist. Nat. iv. 5.

treasures were still to be found in digging the foundations—precious jewels in the midst of potsherds, magnificent vases, and artistic work of every kind. These Corinthian relics were the first object of traffic in the new colony.[1] They also became the training-ground for a revival of art; and possibly Paul's friend Titius Justus was a member of the famous family of potters, the Titii, whose pottery was sent all over the world.[2] So much of the ancient splendour here came to light again from the shards of the classical time, that the soldiery used it to adorn their houses. The colonists built themselves houses in a strange medley of ancient columns, cornices and pilasters of syenite or marble, embellished with gold and silver, finishing them off with wooden huts and thatches of reed and straw, to be swept away by the first fire.[3]

Such was the foundation of the colony Julia Corinthus. It was soon filled again with active commerce and vast wealth. For its favourable situation on two seas denied the Roman colony none of the advantages formerly lavished upon the Bacchiadæ when, in the days of antiquity, the Phœnician was the sole ruler of the seas. Owing to the dangers of circumnavigating the Peloponnese, and the facility of transporting goods across the narrow isthmus, Corinth had a carrying-trade second to none in the world. In addition to this, there were the two good harbours of Cenchreæ and Lechæum. At Cenchreæ, on the Ægean, lay the great merchantmen of Asia and Alexandria; at Lechæum, the innumerable craft that plied to Italy. Travelling to Ephesus, like the deaconess Phœbe (Rom. xvi.), one would go by Cenchreæ; coming from Rome, like Aquila and Priscilla (Acts xviii.), one lands in the harbour of Lechæum. On a longer journey, too, it was usual to disembark here and take fresh ship on the other side. So Propertius sings of his journey to Athens:

[1] Cf. Titius in Pauly, R. E.

[2] Strabo, viii. 6.

[3] 1 Cor. iii. 11.

"Lechæum next! The Ionian sea safe past,
In welcome port the sail sinks from the mast.
Up, feet, 'tis your task now; up, carry me
Where the slight isthmus sunders sea from sea."[1]

Given these conditions of growth, it is no wonder that, at a meeting-place of travel and commerce, a great city stands here once more within the space of a century. Only the ancient Corinth must not be imagined. This colony on the isthmus was a European commercial town with a dominant element of Latin citizens. Moreover, as the capital of the Roman province of Achaia, as the seat of the proconsul, as a colony with a remnant of the old military organization, as a station of a Roman garrison and a Roman fortress, the aspect of the colony Julia Corinthus was far more Latin than Greek. So we find here a temple of Jupiter Capitolinus,[2] and another of the unhappy Octavia.[3] We find the peculiarly Roman pleasures of gladiatorial games and wild-beast fights, so repulsive to the finer elements of the Greek nature.[4] "I too have fought with beasts," writes Paul from Ephesus, a clever simile in which he alludes to the pleasures of the Corinthians.[5]

The history of the growth of the colony further gives the key to the number of Latin names among the Apostle's converts. Reading the names of these Corinthian Christians,—Titius, Justus, Gaius, Crispus, Tertius, Quartus, Fortunatus, and so forth,—one seems to be in an Italian port rather than a city of ancient Greece.[6] Other prominent features, again, recal Asia Minor more than Greek national life. It was but natural that the trade of Asia Minor should contribute its quota to the

[1] Prop. Eleg. iii. 21, 19, seq. [2] Pausan. i. 4. [3] Ibid. i. 3.

[4] Philostr. Apoll. iv. 22. "They have removed the altar of compassion," says Lucian's Demonax in reference to this, chap. lvii.

[5] 1 Cor. xv. 32.

[6] Strabo saw the city under Augustus. Cf., further, Pausanius, ii. 1, who confirms this Roman character of the place as late as the middle of the second century. It is the same in Plutarch's time. De Def. Orac. viii.

population of this trading city; and at the same time there could not fail to be Jews in a place devoted to transhipment which offered so wide scope to their peculiar aptitude for brokerage. In any case they followed wherever the Roman eagle led; but here the way was further smoothed for them among the native inhabitants by Herod, who had earned considerable gratitude in Corinth.[1] Corinth itself had a synagogue, as is seen from the Acts: and a Jewish house of prayer must also be looked for at Cenchreæ, where, according to Strabo, a preponderance of Asiatics had settled.[2] Even in reading the Epistles to the Corinthians we feel in the atmosphere of business which surrounds the little world of merchants, the sound of whose higgling is embarrassingly audible in the building up of the Christian community. Business and sharp practice are the watchwords here; even the Apostle must put up with having a close account kept with him. There are not wanting smart dealers who suspect him of putting something in his own pocket.[3]

A maritime city such as this, without traditions, without a long-settled continuance of civic rights, without aristocracy, and inhabited for the most part by a floating population, does not generally rank very high from a moral point of view. Here, moreover, the vices of the East and West joined hands. The sailors squandered their pay in the taverns; the young merchants lavished their wealth upon the famous courtesans of the isthmus. In Strabo's time, a Corinthian hetæra boasted of having wrecked three ships in next to no time.[4] The leech of Corinth, which sucks the blood of youth, is the gruesome sign of this prostitution.[5] The ancient Corinthians symbolized the same

[1] Pausan. ii. 1.

[2] Cf. Philo, Leg. 36; Strabo, viii. 6, 22. According to Pausanius, ii. 2, the Egyptians also had a temple there.

[3] 2 Cor. xii. 16—20; cf. chaps. ix. and x.

[4] Strabo, viii. 6.

[5] Cf. the story in Philostr. Apoll. iv. 25, which led Goethe to depict the power of *Christianity* in the Bride of Corinth.

thought, half humorously, half in earnest, by placing a lioness in stone, holding a sheep in her claws, upon the grave of the famous Lais.[1] Proverbs in every language gave warning in jest and earnest against the slippery ways of this modern Sodom.[2] To the Apostle, accustomed as he was to Jewish strictness, this openly-published corruption of morals was a perpetual source of alienation; he could only conceive of this condition as a revelation of divine anger. When on his third visit to Corinth he wrote thence his Epistle to the Romans, he looked with blank dismay at the doings of this pagan world which God had given up to the lusts of their hearts, man and woman alike.[3] Amid all the glorious temples and colonnades, built in the purest style, he only saw a generation poisoned by vices and eaten up with sin and the curse of sin. But in Corinth itself no one knew what he really wanted; and when he warned believers to have no converse with fornicators, they replied they must then go out of the world.[4] Nor was this all: Bacchus was worshipped beside Pandemos. The Corinthian wine-bibber was proverbial, and the Corinthian is often brought on the stage drunk.[5] He even got drunk at Christian love-feasts, as Paul says in his rebuke.[6]

The external relations of the city were at this time very peaceful. Such places thrive in the peace and luxury of imperial times. The province of Achaia had indeed been specially given back to the Senate, a fortune the provincials used not to aspire after. The character, too, of the proconsul of 54, ANNÆUS NOVATUS GALLIO, is well known from other accounts.[7] He was a friend to their literature, brother of the philosopher Seneca,

[1] Pausan. ii. 2.
[2] Strabo, l. c.
[3] Rom. i. 21—32.
[4] 1 Cor. v. 9.
[5] Ælian, V. H. iii. 15; Athenæus, x. p. 438, and iv. 137.
[6] 1 Cor. v. 13.
[7] Suet. Claud. xxv. The year 54, which suits our chronology, is fixed for Gallio's proconsulate by Hertzberg, Gesch. Griechenlands unter den Römern, ii. 40. Cf. on the question, Nipperdey on Tacit. Ann. vi. 3, and xv. 73; Clinton, Fast. Rom. Vol. i. p. 17, 25; Seneca, Ep. xviii. 1.

gracious to all, and inaccessible only to flatterers; an official without stiffness, who chatted with the sailors of the place about wind and weather:[1] universally known, in short, for the loveableness of his sympathy, his wit and his character.[2]

To outward view, there was no occasion for complaint. Nevertheless, the evil atmosphere produced by the corruption of the capital, the inward death of national life, and the desolating absence of morally refreshing interests, are most felt precisely in these meeting-places for the whole world. We have already seen in the Epistles to the Thessalonians, written here, that this place more than any other filled Paul with the sense of an impending catastrophe. And he knew how to interpret the signs of the times. His own situation, too, was at first far from enviable.

As we know from various statements, the Apostle had need of a personal attachment, without which he felt isolated and oppressed.[3] Naturally reserved, like all who cannot wholly rely upon their personal powers, the full development of his power required the sense of personal support here lacking. So now he felt "bereaved for a short season," and had no shame in confessing his home-sickness to the church of Thessalonica.[4] In addition, he saw himself given up to painful want; and it suited not at all with the preaching of his gospel to begin with requests for personal relief. Thus, in the first Epistle written here to the Thessalonians, he talks of the distress and affliction he meets with.[5] At a later time he can testify that even when in distress he was a burden to none.[6]

As to whether he first attached himself to those of his own creed at Cenchreæ or Corinth, we have no knowledge. How-

[1] Seneca, Quæst. Nat. v. 11.

[2] Cf. about him the introduction to Seneca De Ira and De Vita Beata, and the introduction to the fourth Book of the Quæst. Nat.; Tac. Ann. vi. 3, xv. 13, xvi. 17; Dio Cass. lx. 30, lxi. 20.

[3] 1 Thess. iii. 1; 2 Cor. ii. 13; 2 Tim. iv. 9—12; Acts xviii. 5.

[4] 1 Thess. ii. 17. [5] 2 Cor. xi. 7—12. [6] 1 Thess. iii. 7.

ever, we learn incidentally that the first converts Paul made in Achaia belonged to a Corinthian house. It was the family of a slave Stephanas, belonging to a Greek lady named Chloe. Paul being alone, baptized "the firstling of Achaia" himself, together with all his relations dependent on him, a duty he generally left to his companions.[1] Two more slaves from the house of Chloe were afterwards converted, Fortunatus and Achaicus. According to the end of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, this menial room remained one of the principal meeting-places of the Pauline party; the especial glory of Stephanas' house being that "they set themselves to minister to the saints" with great zeal.[2]

In externals, Paul's position underwent a change in one important respect. In his search, perhaps, for work, he discovered, not only a fellow-craftsman, but a man of the same religion, who, lately banished from Rome, had just reached Lechæum, and now made common cause with Paul. These new arrivals, Aquila and Priscilla, for she too was a Christian, had boldly taken part in the struggles over the Messiahship of Jesus in the Roman ghetto; for it is related in the Acts that both had been compelled to leave Rome through the edict of the emperor Claudius already spoken of.[3] Aquila was a native of Pontus, where other instances of the name appear among the Jews.[4] He and his wife Prisca must have played an important part in the Christian Church of their time, for they are mentioned in four different books of the New Testament. From the fact of Prisca being everywhere mentioned first,[5] it has been inferred that the chief share in this Christian work must have lain with her. Certain

[1] 2 Cor. xi. 8.

[2] 1 Cor. i. 11, 16, xvi. 17.

[3] Acts xviii. 3; Suet. Claud. xxv.

[4] Onkelos, the famous translator of the Old Testament, also came from Pontus. Aquila in Greek becomes Akylos, for which reason Onkelos and Aquila are sometimes identified.

[5] Acts xviii. 18, 26; Rom. xvi. 3; 2 Tim. iv. 19. The only exception is 1 Cor. xvi. 19.

it is that Paul speaks of both with gratitude and affection, and considers "all the churches of the Gentiles" in their debt.[1]

By a happy coincidence, Aquila and Paul were fellow-craftsmen, and agreed to carry on their work in common. After this, Silas arrived with gifts from the Philippians,[2] and with him Timothy, so that not only were the material needs of the Apostle supplied, but Paul and his two partners, Aquila and his wife, Stephanas and his family, together with Fortunatus and Achaicus, now constituted the beginnings of a little church, numbering not more than a dozen souls, but inspired by the Apostle's confidence of victory. "Now we are comforted in all our distress and affliction," he writes to his Thessalonians, and the Acts tell that he continued to devote himself to the Word. Here, once more, the natural point to work from in enlarging the little band he had gathered round him was offered by the synagogue. Its ruler was Crispus: judging from his Latin name, a descendant from one of the Roman colonists, and therefore a proselyte of righteousness or son of a proselyte, for otherwise he would have been incapable of bearing an office in the synagogue.

We see from Paul's own references to his preaching in Corinth that here, as elsewhere, he based his preaching essentially upon the proof that the Scriptures foretold a suffering Messiah. "I delivered unto you first of all," he writes to the Corinthians, "how that Christ died for our sins *according to the Scriptures*."[3] Indeed, he plainly calls his preaching a word of the cross, which the Jews held to be blasphemous and the Greeks derided as folly.[4] As ambassador of Christ and preacher of the redeeming death, he came forward and cried to the synagogue: "Be ye reconciled to God."[5] The consequence was a hot and passionate resistance on the part of the Jews, directed alike against the humiliation of the cross and the extension of the Messianic promises to the Gentiles. "They opposed themselves and blasphemed," say the Acts, and Paul confirms the statement. "I was in weakness and fear and

[1] Rom. xvi. 3. [2] 2 Cor. xi. 9; Phil. iv. 15.
[3] 1 Cor. xv. 3. [4] 1 Cor. i. 23, ii. 2. [5] 2 Cor. v. 20.

great trembling among you," he afterwards writes to Corinth, and at the same time informs the Thessalonians: "We were appointed to bear afflictions;" he speaks of distress and affliction,[1] and breaks out in bitter words against the Jews, who resist the preaching of the Messiah exactly as they resisted Jesus twenty years before at Jerusalem,—who persecute the apostles as they persecuted the prophets and the Messiah himself, showing themselves the enemies of all men in preventing the gospel from being preached to the Gentiles.[2]

From some passages in the Epistles to the Corinthians, it may be inferred that the struggle ended at last in the introduction of factitious traces of the outpouring of the spirit, such as usually appeared among Jewish communities in the form of prophecy, speaking with tongues and miracles. "My speech and my preaching were not in persuasive words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the spirit and of power: that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God."[3] That this was the course of the struggle is still more clearly pointed out by Paul's question to the Corinthians: "What is there wherein ye were made inferior to the rest of the churches? Were not the signs of an apostle wrought among you in all patience by signs and wonders and mighty works?"[4] This proof by miracle was universally resorted to in the religious struggle of the time. As the Jews beside the Lake of Tiberias had but one demand to make of Jesus, "Show us a sign,"—as the Messiahs who now began to reappear in Palestine were met by the same cry of "Show us a sign,"—so Paul complains in Corinth that the Greeks seek after wisdom and the Jews ask for signs.[5] Paul was able to appeal to mighty works of the kind, but it was the case here as it always will be with proof by miracle—those who were already convinced admitted the miracles, while the rest were hardened in their opposition. While Paul saw in his fortunate cures and the manifestation of speak-

[1] 1 Thess. iii. 4, 7. [2] 1 Thess. ii. 14—16. [3] 1 Cor. ii. 4, 5.
[4] 2 Cor. xii. 12. [5] 1 Cor. i. 23.

ing in tongues a sign of God for unbelievers that ought to move their conscience,[1] his opponents were rather inclined to hale him to the judgment-seat for an impostor.[2] Thus the split in the synagogue between believers and unbelievers was definite, though not so entire as to prevent itinerant teachers from afterwards renewing the attempt to prove Jesus' Messiahship in the synagogue services.[3]

This period of storm, obviously lasting for some time, is compressed by the Acts into one dramatic moment, when Paul shook out his raiment before the blaspheming Jews and cried to them: "Your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean: from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles." According to what Paul writes to the Thessalonians, the impression he received from the demeanour of his countrymen was, that they could not cease to "kill the prophets and fill up the measure of their sins alway, so that the wrath of God has come upon them to the uttermost."[4] The Acts, which endeavours to fix the time of the various visions mentioned by Paul in 2 Cor. xii. 1, 2, 8, and transfers one of them to his fortnight's stay at Jerusalem,[5] places another at the time of these struggles. "And the Lord said unto Paul in the night by a vision, Be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace: for I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to harm thee: for I have much people in this city."[6]

It is highly conceivable that on this occasion, as on others, Paul's action in the conflict was determined from within. However this may be, he resolved to appear no more in the synagogue. A proselyte of the gate, named Titius Justus, who had a house close by the synagogue, offered it him to hold his addresses in. From this time forth, it became the meeting-place of the community of believers. This step was seconded by a decisive event. The ruler of the synagogue, Crispus, who had

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 22, xii. 7, 8.
[2] Acts xviii. 12.
[3] Acts xviii. 28; 1 Cor. iii. 6.
[4] 1 Thess. ii. 15, 16.
[5] Acts xxii. 17.
[6] Acts xviii. 9.

so often read and expounded the law to the assembled Jews, came over to Paul's church. It was a great success; and Paul, contrary to his usual custom, baptized him in person.[1] He also baptized one Gaius, who lived in better circumstances and had a house of his own, which in its turn received the church.[2] Gaius, "my host and of the whole church," was the man with whom the Apostle afterwards lived on his third visit to Corinth, when his relations with the Jewish-Christian party were greatly overcast.[3] In course of time we note the accession of other persons of importance: Erastus, the treasurer of the city, undoubtedly therefore a native, occupying a public office; Quartus, and Tertius the ready writer, who indited the Epistle to the Romans—men whose very names prove them to be citizens of Corinth and descendants of the old Latin colony of veterans.[4] To these may be added three Jews, Lucius, Jason and Sosipater,[5] who were reckoned among the most devoted. Round these centres, Chloe's slave-room and the houses of Titius Justus and Gaius, the life of the new church first moved. It seems, therefore, that the conquests of Christianity had spread as far as middle-class citizens, including a few Jews and proselytes and a large number of Gentiles. Of the latter, the greater majority were of the humblest grade. Many, according to the Apostle's account, were slaves by calling;[6] many weak and sickly had hastened to attach themselves to the glad tidings;[7] but "not many wise, not many mighty, not many noble." The church counted among its members neither wealthy merchants nor influential officials,[8] nor could it pride itself on famous names. Lawyers from the synagogue and sophists of the academy both held aloof;[9] instead, it had pleased Providence "to choose the weak and base and despised things of the world."[10] The Apostle

[1] 1 Cor. i. 14.
[2] Rom. xvi. 23.
[3] 1 Cor. i. 14; Rom. xvi. 23.
[4] Rom. xvi. 22, 23.
[5] Rom. xvi. 21.
[6] 1 Cor. vii. 21, xii. 13.
[7] 1 Cor. xi. 30.
[8] 1 Cor. i. 26.
[9] 1 Cor. i. 20.
[10] 1 Cor. i. 26—29.

had plunged deep indeed into the lowest dens of this city of sailors and slaves, and in his first Epistle says: "Fornicators, idolaters, adulterers, effeminate, abusers of yourselves with men, thieves, covetous, drunkards, revilers and extortioners, such were some of you."[1]

Thus the Apostle's work presents itself as that of a missionary who plants himself in the most abandoned quarter of a great city, to search out the image of the divine even in the darkest retreats of sin, where all other hope is given up; to seek whether he cannot find some spark left in the heap of ashes to be rekindled into flame. The fact must be dwelt upon in order to realize that things might happen afterwards in the Church in glaring contrast to the title of saints with which Paul honoured those who were converted and baptized. Two things show that a great, perhaps overwhelming, majority of women belonged to the Church—one, the various ordinances for maidens, matrons, divorced women and widows, such as are to be found in the 7th and 11th chapters; the other, the part which women assumed in the congregations. For here there was need of the admonition, *Mulier taceat in ecclesia.* By name, however, we only hear of two, Prisca, Aquila's wife, and Phœbe, the deaconess, whose work lay in Cenchreæ, who was "a succourer" of many, including the Apostle himself.[2]

The total number of converts won by the united efforts of Paul, Silas and Timothy, cannot be determined with any accuracy. The church assembles in a private house. Now it is well known that ancient houses were not very spacious, even those of well-to-do people, for they did a great deal in the open air which we should do indoors. For this reason, then, the numbers of the church must be reckoned by tens, and not by hundreds. Even after the church has been in existence four years, general love-feasts take place in which the whole church participates. This also points to no excessive numbers. The circumstances of individuals touched upon in our Epistles further make it likely

[1] 1 Cor. vi. 9. [2] Rom. xvi. 1, 2.

that the size of the community still permitted the acquaintance of all members with one another, or else the Apostle would not enlighten the assemblages of the church upon the most varied circumstances of private life.[1] On the other hand, the mere fact of a church existing in such a place was so important that before long the eyes of all Christendom were directed towards it.[2] All the chief itinerant teachers of apostolic times worked here in succession; Paul and Titus, Silas and Timothy, Aquila and Apollos, Sosthenes, and immediate disciples of Christ whose names are unknown to us.[3] In the course of four years, too, the church had become so strong that it admitted of four parties being formed within it, all actively engaged in controversy. The church may therefore muster a hundred souls, or a few more at most; to rate its strength higher is forbidden by its system of divine worship and its very primitive organization.

Still this new society, established on the border-land between Jews and Gentiles, seemed to owe its very existence to the synagogue at Corinth. The proselytes here showed a disposition to set up an independent organization outside the synagogue, which saw in it an aping of the Jewish service, seemingly due, not to obedience, but to hatred of the law.[4] Now considering that liberty of worship was conceded to the Jews "according to the law," they not unnaturally took it to mean that the Roman proconsul would not tolerate a heterodox community of Jews. They dragged Paul before Gallio's judgment-seat, and charged him with transgressing the law. They can hardly have failed, moreover, to refer to what had happened in Rome. The edict of Claudius as it stood supported their demands. But the charge seems to have been wanting in definiteness. If the Jews had complained of the spreading of a *religio illicita*, some doubt might exist as to the proper decision of the proconsul. But the Jews seemed not yet resolved to regard the preaching of the Messiah's coming

[1] Such as the individual questions of marriage, chap. vii.
[2] 2 Cor. iii. 3. [3] 1 Cor. i. 1, ii. 4; 2 Cor. i. 19, viii. 23.
[4] 1 Thess. iii. 4, ii. 16; Acts xviii. 13.

as a new religion. This being the case, Gallio might well regard the quarrel between Jews and Christians as one which even the tribunals of the capital considered an internal quarrel of the Jewish community "concerning doctrine, names and law," which the synagogue alone should take cognizance of. Gallio, too, being naturally inclined to a policy of *laisser faire*, did not expel the authors of the quarrel, as Aquila had been expelled by the prætor of the capital, and forbade neither Jews nor Christians their assemblies, but contented himself with dismissing the case from his tribunal, as the synagogue was itself capable of deciding it, and there was no question of civil transgression or any crime.[1] Whether the synagogue could pronounce the lesser or the greater banishment against Paul, or enforce its will in any other way, the proconsul was equally unable to decide whether the Messiah of the Jews had appeared or not. His ironical decision is entirely in character with the real Seneca's brother, who was a slave to his wit. But the Jews, with their usual stiffneckedness, refusing to quit the place, were forcibly ejected, and the Greek mob, delighted at the uproar, seized upon Sosthenes, the ruler of the synagogue, and maltreated him in the basilica under the very eyes of Gallio, without the latter stirring a finger in his defence.

This defeat put an end to all opposition. Gallio's decision enabled Paul to stay in Corinth a considerable time, fully eighteen months. The introduction of the two Epistles to the Corinthians shows that Paul did not confine his work to the capital of Achaia, but that churches were rapidly founded in all parts of Gallio's province.[2] As the Epistles think of this Achaian Dispersion as in constant intercourse with the parent church, they must probably be looked for chiefly in the neighbouring towns of Cenchreæ, Crommyon, Tenea, Sicyon, Schœnus and Lechæum.

The Apostle was thus permitted to organize the church in Corinth himself.[3] It is possible to form a very fair picture of its arrangement. The house of Titius Justus, in which the

[1] Acts xviii. 15. [2] 2 Cor. i. 1, ix. 2. [3] 1 Cor. xi. 2.

assemblies were held, stood close by the synagogue;[1] and the synagogue itself, according to Jewish usage, was either on the hill-top, i.e. on the edge of the Acrocorinthus, or beside a running stream—here, therefore, somewhere in the neighbourhood of the clear bed of the Pirene. The furniture of these rooms, with their benches and separate seats for the two sexes, we have already described, according to the description of the church in the house of Titius.[2] The assemblies took place at night, when, the workshops being closed, the slaves could come, and Paul and Aquila laid aside their laborious work.[3] For edification, Paul maintained that each member should have the joy of co-operating as he was able. The congregation sat to listen: only those stood up who wished to speak. The next question to be decided was, whether the speaker or reader should wear the Jewish tallith on his head while speaking, after the fashion of most Orientals, Jews, Arabs and Syrians alike, in prayer; or whether it was seemly for the Christian to address God with uncovered head, even as the Greek custom was to enter the temple bare-headed.[4] Paul decided for the Greek custom against that of his own nation, for man was made in the image of God, and there was no reason for covering up God's image.[5] He held it a proud privilege of the sons of God to address the Father with face uncovered. The veil which lies on the head of the Jew during the reading seems to him symbolic—lying on the heart of the Jew, on the very Scriptures, so that the readers in the synagogues do not understand what they read.[6] On the whole, however, the arrangement of divine service was moulded upon the pattern of the synagogue. Its principal divisions were reading of the Scriptures, exposition and discussion.

As to Paul's own preaching, the substance of it can without doubt be taken from the Epistle to the Romans, written in

[1] Acts xviii. 7.

[2] Vide Vol. ii. p. 217 (Eng. trans.), after 1 Cor. xiv. 30, xi. 6.

[3] Acts xx. 3; after the hour of supper, 1 Cor. xi. 21.

[4] 1 Cor. xi. 2, 4; 2 Cor. iii. 18. [5] 1 Cor. xi. 7. [6] 2 Cor. iii. 18.

Corinth. During his first visit, as at Thessalonica, eschatological ideas still occupied the foreground. Paul preached of the judgment and the resurrection of the dead. What he wrote any day from Corinth to the church of Thessalonica, he certainly discussed in the evening at Titius Justus' house. For proof we have the discussion of the resurrection in 1 Cor., which develops all the questions we have already encountered at Thessalonica.[1] The church itself was in an almost equally tense state of apocalyptic feeling. The day has drawn so near that Chloe's bondsmen shall shake their chains no more, nor the daughters of Tertius, Quartus and Titius, look about for husbands.[2] Here, as elsewhere, fear of the catastrophe was implanted in every soul; and there is no lack of traces to show what an impression this Johannine preaching made on a generation beneath whose feet the solid ground seemed to totter. Every one regarded his actions from the point of view in which they would appear before the tribunal of the Judge now close at hand.[3] Some, lamenting those who had already fallen asleep and were excluded from the coming salvation, underwent vicarious baptism over their graves; others thought of the day when they should sit in judgment over the world—nay, even over Satan and his evil spirits.[4]

The cardinal fact, however, was that the spring rain of holy inspiration fell upon men's hearts; all seeds of goodness sprang up and blossomed abundantly in word and deed of mutual help and good-will. There was a revival of every gift, such as usually comes in times of great enthusiasm—a revival of all that slumbered in the depths of the Greek nature. The lofty theme of the gospel roused oratory, profundity, instructiveness, among these else undistinguished men. Paul saw with pride how they who before had been led to dumb idols, themselves dumb and without volition, like beasts of the field—now, under the influence of the new spirit, developed individual life, distinct gifts,

[1] 1 Cor. xv.
[2] 1 Cor. vii. 6, 20.
[3] 1 Cor. i. 7, iii. 13.
[4] 1 Cor. xv. 29, vi. 2.

and original powers of speech. He saw with gratitude to God how they were enriched in all utterance and all knowledge, and fell short in no gift.[1] It was not long, then, before the congregations here were able to supply their own spiritual needs, though Paul and his disciples should be absent. Further weight and dignity were given to the congregations by the reading of the now considerable correspondence of the churches with one another, and discussion of the necessary replies.

It can be seen from the ceremonial and liturgical tone of the Epistles to the Corinthians that it was the regular custom to attend a general meeting for worship in the evening; and it may be imagined how those who took part in the gatherings, hit by the Apostle's sharp reproofs, buzzed and postured and gesticulated together with Greek vivacity, after the thunders of the Apostle had rolled over their heads. We have indeed full accounts of the clamour from these wounded spirits which followed the first moment of stupefaction. The obduracy and passion of their replies is shown by the answer being given by the whole church and not by individuals, who perhaps may have felt very differently in the privacy of their own homes. The same opinion may be gathered from the abundant praise at the beginning and the conclusion of the apostolic letters, which does justice to the better elements, yet, like the blame, is given collectively, because the Epistle is to be read before the whole congregation, and the Apostle sees the church in its better representatives.

In addition to these hours of edification and the assemblies devoted to foreign relations, common meals were taken, to which each contributed his share. They concluded with the passing round of the blessed cup and bread, a reminiscence of the rites of the Passover.[2] The primitive community of goods had already shrunk, therefore, to this symbolic act of the common meal, and it was not long before the distinction between *meum* and *tuum* re-asserted itself in its entirety even at these common

[1] 1 Cor. i. 4—6, xii. 1—12. [2] 1 Cor. xi. 26.

meals.[1] On all these points the Apostle had himself drawn up the necessary regulations,[2] and, according to his own testimony, they were the same as had been introduced into all Christian churches.[3]

On the other hand, the organization seems to have been somewhat loosely strung together. It is true that we find deacons and deaconesses immediately, who devote themselves to care of the poor and sick. So, too, the family of the slave Stephanas, whose mistress Chloe seems to have left her people considerable freedom of action,[4] and the deaconess Phœbe in Cenchreæ,[5] who was in a position to serve many; but the Apostle treats the direction and administration of the church as a gift to be exercised rather than as a definite office.[6] He speaks indeed of an office of an apostle, prophet and teacher, but not that of presbyter and president.[7] The place of such officials is taken by the founders of the church, such as the family of Stephanas and all who are similarly helpful in their labours for the church, including therefore the hosts Titius Justus and Gaius, for whom he demands obedience and subjection.[8] While, then, a firm organization had sprung up of itself in the more military Macedonia, Greek intolerance of restraint rejected all authority of the ecclesia, so that influence attached only to the actual merits of the founders, i.e. the "firstlings," and those who performed some duty. The consequences of this spirit were patent in the turbulence and disorder which soon crept in at Corinth.

Paul, indeed, could stay here longer than elsewhere, but not long enough for a settlement. He was not ordained to build up each church until all was fairly roofed in. "My grace," he writes to the Corinthians, "is to lay a foundation, and another buildeth thereon."[9] He stayed a year and half; then he beheld other fields, white for the harvest, that beckoned him away. When, at the close of the year 55, Aquila and Priscilla departed

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 18.
[2] 1 Cor. xi. 2.
[3] 1 Cor xi. 16, xiv. 36.
[4] 1 Cor. xvi. 15.
[5] Rom. xvi. 1.
[6] 1 Cor. xii. 27—29.
[7] Ibid.
[8] 1 Cor. xvi. 16.
[9] 1 Cor. iii. 10.

for Ephesus, Paul too broke loose to fill up the gap he had left between Galatia and Achaia.

---

3. Proconsular Asia.[1]

The new missionary post chosen by Paul in the year 55, the capital of proconsular Asia, was a "holy city" of the first rank and of immemorial antiquity. The whole life of the province still centred around the temple of the old Phœnician mariners at Ephesus. Assyrian Istar, Phœnician Astarte, the moon-goddess, here blended with Ma, Cybele, or Anaitis, the goddess of Asia Minor, and assumed the name of the Greek Artemis. Century after century the place had rung with the cry, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians," and the wanton life of an Asiatic temple continued to be the most important factor in the life of the city.

Ephesus—thanks to its situation and its rank as seat of the proconsul—was far too important to remain exclusively in the service of bigotry. With all its hieratic paraphernalia, the city was also a chief mart of Asia and the Ægean Sea. Its commerce grew daily; Strabo describes Ephesus as the chief centre of trade in the whole of Asia Minor. The impression made by this busy traffic is most clearly reflected in the Apocalypse, a book written here ten years later by a Jewish Christian. Many a time the eye of the writer ranges over the sea and the passing ships;[2] then in turn it rests upon the traffic in the harbour of Panormus, where the ship-masters stand, and "the merchants and mariners, and as many that gain their living by the sea." He hears, too, "the voice of harpers, and minstrels, and flute-players, and trumpeters;" he sees "merchandise of gold, and silver, and precious stones, and pearls, and fine linen, and purple, and silk, and scarlet; and all thyine wood, and every vessel of

[1] Cic. Pro Flacco, 27; Plin. Hist. Nat. v. 28. More particularly, "Apostel Paulus," 2nd ed. 339; and Zimmermann, Ephesos, Leipzig, 1874.

[2] Rev. viii. 9, x. 6, xiii. 1.

ivory, and every vessel made of most precious wood, and of brass, and iron, and marble; and cinnamon, and spice, and incense, and ointment, and frankincense, and wine, and oil, and fine flour, and wheat, and cattle, and sheep, and merchandise of horses, and chariots, and slaves, and souls of men."[1]

Looking upon this busy life, the writer of the Apocalypse proceeds to relate the impression made upon this human ant-heap by the tidings of the first sign of the judgment which he looks for from Rome. "The merchants of these things shall weep and mourn, that their goods are bought no more. The mariners cried out as they looked upon the smoke of the burning of the city; and they cast dust on their heads, and cried, Woe! woe! the great city wherein were made rich all that had their ships in the sea by reason of her costliness! for in one hour she is made desolate."[2] The writer of the Apocalypse, we see, looks with no kindly eye upon the busy whirl of the great city. While Paul, who of course began as a citizen of a great municipality, and had seen the lands and cities of many men in the course of his life, espies "doors" on every side here in Ephesus through which the gospel might find an entrance,[3] the writer of the Apocalypse looks in distaste, aversion, nay, malevolence, upon the Gentile movement which stirs Paul to the heart. While it was precisely here that Paul felt the stir of the spirit and imparted it, the Jewish Christian John is forced to flee away to the quiet of Patmos when the spirit of the Lord is to speak to him. He is provoked by Gentile life, which meets him at every turn. His anger is stirred by all the blasphemous titles assumed by the Roman government, the official inscriptions, the Gentile images on the coins he is forced to touch in every-day life; he thinks one of the worst assaults of Antichrist is that he prevents any from buying or selling without pollution.[4] He finds the

[1] Rev. xviii. 13. The slave-market of Corinth was particularly famous, and ranked above that of Delos, where 10,000 were often sold in one day. Strabo, xiv. 985.

[2] Rev. xviii. 15—20. [3] 1 Cor. xvi. 9. [4] Rev. xiii. 17.

Roman beast a beast rich in names of blasphemy. To his Jewish ear the titles of the Cæsars, Augustus, Divus, Sebastus, are rank blasphemy. There is but one good, and that is God.

For this reason he looks angrily upon the Ephesian people, which even after the visible judgments of God cannot cease to "worship devils, and idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and of wood: which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk; neither repented they of their murders, nor of their sorceries, nor of their fornication, nor of their thefts." Such was the impression of life in Ephesus received by one of uncompromising Jewish temper. How different it is with Paul, writing to Corinth: "I will tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost; for a great door and effectual is opened unto me, and there are many adversaries."[1] The Alexandrian Apollos also prefers working here to working in Achaia; here, too, Aquila and Priscilla settle permanently, and gather a church in their house.

But long before any of these, the synagogue of Ephesus had taken up the war against paganism. Paul and John only set up their tents there because others had first made a clearing in the primeval wilds of superstition. From of old, the synagogue at Ephesus had been especially active in profiting by the dislike of the better citizens towards the established religion, thus preparing the way for Christianity.[2] There had long been Jews in Ephesus. Notwithstanding the opposition of the native citizens, the Diadochi had already permitted them to assume the name of Ephesians, while their speedy adhesion to Rome bore good fruit here as elsewhere.[3] They managed to gain a variety of privileges from the proconsul Dolabella and other Roman officials, as recorded by Josephus. Their worship was placed under the protection of the archons, while the Ephesian Jew was relieved from military service.[4] It is clear, both from their petitions for free intercourse with the temple and from the fortunes of the Apostle Paul, what lively intercourse was

[1] 1 Cor. xvi. 9.
[2] Philo, Leg. p. 40.
[3] Jos. Ap. ii. 4.
[4] Ant. xiv. 10, 12, xiii. 22.

maintained between the local ghetto and the temple at Jerusalem. The narrative of the Acts also gives the impression of very stirring religious life.

Now considering that the riotous worship of Diana was forced upon its notice,[1] so zealous a church must have felt doubly incited to open a propaganda among its Gentile fellow-citizens. It appears from the Acts how far this wild cult was supported by the purely material interests of the pilgrims' shrine, the image-makers, and the holders of the rich endowments of the temple of Diana. So it came to pass that the Jews of Ephesus had repeatedly essayed to arouse the moral sensibility of their Greek fellow-citizens against these proceedings. Before the abolition of the eunuch-priesthood by Domitian[2]—in the time, therefore, of the first emperors—a Jew made a crafty attack upon the temple of Diana by mercilessly unmasking all the harm done by the religious orgies, and urging the recognition of a single deity by keen satire, directed especially against idolatry. An epistle, professing to be from the pen of the philosopher Heraclitus, gave the Jewish writer the idea of delivering his invectives under the grave features of the mob-hating philosopher, who, legend said, declared the Ephesians deserved to be put to death, every man of them.[3] He, beyond all others, had chosen to mock the Ephesians: and for this reason our author, versed in the Scriptures and deeply read in Aristotle's Ethics, composed several letters, in which Heraclitus the Obscure explains to the Ephesians why all his life long he had never laughed. Starting from a point of view entirely that of the Old Testament, Heraclitus raises the question, Why do the wicked prosper, and their city, spite of all vices, flourish? He arrives at the Biblical conclusion: God does not punish by taking away wealth. Rather He gives it to the wicked in order that, possessing the means, they may sin even to condemnation.[4] "May you, then," he adds,

[1] Strabo, l. c.

[2] Suet. Dom. vii.; Pseudo-Heraclit. Ep. ix.; cf. Bernays, 108.

[3] Strabo, l. c. [4] Heraclit. Ep. viii.; Bernays, 83; cf James v. 5.

with a glance of hate at the wealth beside the harbour of Panormus, "never lack in prosperity, that your wickedness may bring down due chastisement."

The writer then proceeds to attack all excesses of Ephesian idolatry. With the calm of hatred he analyzes its every institution, to hold each up to its due contempt. The shrine in which the image usually stands receives hardly any light except from the door, and is therefore in half-darkness; he makes merry over the divinity who is put in the dark. It is a byword "to be made of stone;"[1] stone gods are therefore blasphemous. The mere scantiness of the pedestal is a slight on him whom heaven and earth cannot contain.

From idolatry in general, the writer turns to the worship of Artemis in particular, which he finds lower than the habits of beasts. "No dog," says he, "ever mutilated another dog as you have treated your goddess's Megabyzus, because you are ashamed to let a man minister before her virginity. Should not the high-priest rather curse the wooden image in whose honour he has been ill-treated? Is it not folly to impute unchastity to the goddess by the ordinance that only eunuchs shall approach her?" But the orgies of Cybele-worship are to him the sum of all evil; those nocturnal feasts of torches and all the ancient rites which only exist to throw their mantle over abomination and crime. "For these things' sake," says the Jewish Heraclitus, "have I ceased from laughter. I am alone in the city. You have made it desolate with your wickedness. Shall I laugh when you begging priests go your rounds, bag in hand, each filled with his peculiar vice? Shall I be moved to laughter when I see men act thus, when I regard their dress and beards, or see what vanity of care is expended on the adornment of their heads; how a mother finds her child mixing poison, how minors have their wealth squandered, how a citizen is robbed of his wife, a maiden violently ravished in a nocturnal orgie of religion, a damsel not yet grown into a woman sick with all the ills of

[1] Odyss. xix. 163.

womanhood; how a single boy is the beloved of all the city; or, again, when I see the lavishing of oil or ointment; the profusion of wine at the club dinners which men pawn their very rings to give; the sums of money that are poured into the belly; and civic assemblies in solemn conclave to receive the judges' reports of the momentous legal decisions touching the theatre. For these things' sake, I have ceased to laugh."

Now this vivid picture of public and domestic life at Ephesus is but the basis from which our author attempts to reach belief in the true God. He pursues the method of the Epistle to the Romans, starting from the sins of the Gentile world which God has given up to its own lusts. As far as is in the least compatible with the mask of the heathen philosopher, he shows that salvation and redemption are only to be found in faith in *one* God, and, indirectly, breaks a lance on behalf of Judaism by rebuking the Ephesians who exclude their metics from common rights, however deserving by their virtues of promotion to the roll of citizens. But the mask of the philosopher is most lifted when he actually makes Heraclitus advocate the Noachian laws, and, in addition to the other precept, especially insists on the prohibition of eating living flesh, the eating of raw meat being one of the most essential parts of the Bacchic orgies.[1]

In short, laughter vanished entirely from the countenance of this Heraclitus at the detestable sights surrounding him on every side. He almost recals the writer of the Apocalypse, who, like him, sees in Ephesus nothing but names of blasphemy, one abomination after another, calling the inhabitants of the city dogs, whores, wizards, murderers and idolaters, who may go to destruction for all he cares.[2] The use of Heraclitus' name in this moral preaching and polemic, so skilfully and so eloquently conducted, shows directly that the body of Jews, even in Ephesus, enjoyed the learned culture which then was famous in the Jew Apollos, the native of Alexandria and convert to Christianity. It shows further that religious interests occupied a prominent

[1] Ep. vii.; Bernays, 68, 73.

[2] Rev. xiii. 17, xxii. 11, 15.

place, and that the Ephesian Jews did not only live for their commercial interests, but were also conscious of a religious mission. How zealously they fulfilled it, is betrayed by some Sibylline oracles,[1] which hope to strike the heart of the Gentiles by the announcement of divine wrath. One of them connects the fall of the temple of Diana directly with the dawn of the Messianic time:

> "— Hereafter, turned to dust
> Diana's fane, reared high in Ephesus,
> Shall in the stress and shock of the whelming sea
> Sink like a ship sucked down by the sea-waves,
> And fallen Ephesus wail upon the strand
> Seeking her temple still, where none dwells more,
> For the sky-shaker, with his bolts of flame,
> In one vast ruin hurls the wicked down."[2]

Finally, we have a personal representative of the Jewish propaganda in the "Chaldæan" of Ephesus, already mentioned, Balbillus, who exercised great influence upon Nero, and promised him the kingdom of Jerusalem on the strength of the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament.[3] Indeed, the legend of Nero's return appeared at Ephesus most strikingly as a result of this prophecy, and was itself taken up into the Apocalypse, written in this city. It is at all events a proof, not only that the Messianic question was much discussed here, but also that the ideas of the Jewish and Christian propaganda were still nearly at one.

It is not astonishing that a community in such a state of religious excitement had heard some echo of the Baptist movement beside Jordan. When Aquila and Paul reached the city in the year 55, they found there, according to the Acts, a small community of Baptists still in existence.[4] In addition, however, a Christian community had been formed and brought into direct relations with the twelve apostles by Andronicus and Junias,

[1] In Friedlieb, pp. 64, 70, 114.
[2] Sib. v. 293, seq.
[3] Suet. Nero, xl.; Dio, lxvi. 9.
[4] Acts xix. 1, seq.

the first proselyte in Asia being named Epænetus.[1] As to the famous Alexandrian Apollos, too, it is not quite clear from the expressions used in the Acts whether he already belonged to the Christian or only to the Baptist community when Aquila and Paul settled at Ephesus. On the other hand, the Apocalypse states most distinctly that a Christian church existed in the capital Ephesus before Paul appeared there, vouchsafing it praise from a Jewish point of view: "I know thy works and thy toil and patience, and that thou canst not bear evil men, and didst try them which call themselves apostles, and they are not, and didst find them false."[2]

It follows that there existed in Ephesus a Messianic community of strongly Jewish tendencies before Paul came there; and it is precisely here that we learn what the Apostle means by writing, "The adversaries are many." The Judaistic party, which has obtained a firm footing in Galatia, Paul's own sphere of work, will not so much as suffer him to come forward here. That they were not particular in their means is shown by the complaint the Apostle makes from Ephesus that he had been in dangers even from "false brethren,"[3] and from his warning to Timothy, to whom he writes at Ephesus: "Alexander the copper-smith did me much evil: the Lord will render to him according to his works; of whom be thou ware also, for he greatly withstood our words."[4] So, too, the writer of the First Epistle to Timothy still had some knowledge of these struggles, for he makes Paul, before his departure to Macedonia, bid Timothy stay at Ephesus to "charge some that they teach no other doctrine."[5] A certain want of unity is further implied in the fact that we hear of different Christian meeting-places. One community meets at Aquila's house,[6] two in slave-rooms,[7]

[1] Rom. xvi. 7, seq. [2] Rev. ii. 2. [3] 2 Cor. xi. 26.

[4] 2 Tim. iv. 14. For the genuine portions of this Epistle, see below.

[5] 1 Tim. i. 3, whose author, of course, puts forward the later Gnostic Judaism as hostile to the Apostle.

[6] Rom. xvi. 5. [7] Rom. xvi. 14, 15.

one, according to the Acts, in the school of Tyrannus.[1] At the same time, however, the severance between the believers in Christ and the synagogue was not by any means such as to prevent Paul from taking part in the addresses in the synagogue for the space of three months,[2] whence it may be inferred that the Jewish Christians clung to the synagogue both before this and after.

Now the Acts, true to its reconciling tendency, draws an impenetrable veil over these internal quarrels among the Christian brethren. First of all, it tells that after a short stay at Ephesus, Paul journeyed to Jerusalem, which is very possible after two years spent in collecting for the poor there. But it entirely passes over this very collection, which plays so odious a part in the legend of Simon, and tells instead that a Nazirite vow took the great opponent of justification by works to the holy city; under which circumstances, moreover, there is something suspicious in the great trouble taken by the Ephesian Jews to detain him in Ephesus. After completing his visit to Jerusalem, Paul returns to Ephesus by way of Antioch, Galatia and Phrygia. That Paul really had been recently in Galatia between 55 and 58, we see from 1 Cor.,[3] but no further traces of his eastern journey can be discovered, while Paul himself tells of a greater journey which afterwards brought him to Corinth. In spite of this, the chief scene of his labours during these years may well have been Ephesus, where the famous manufactures of tents and carpets brought together countless workmen of his craft.[4]

For the discussion of this period we are thrown back upon very few documents, giving a sadly inadequate picture of the Ephesian church. In Rom. xvi. 1—16, we possess a letter of recommendation for the deaconess Phœbe, addressed from Cenchreæ to the Ephesian church; and in 2 Tim. i. 1, 2, 15—18, iv. 9—18, a letter to Timothy at Ephesus. From the former we

[1] Acts xix. 9. [2] Acts xix. 8. [3] 1 Cor. xvi. 1.

[4] Plut. Alcib. xi.; Athenæus, xv. 534.

see that a large body of male and female slaves has gradually attached itself to the church in addition to the older members, already called Christians. Paul has nothing but good to say of them; but in the other and later Epistle he complains: "This thou knowest, that all that are in Asia turned away from me; of whom are Phygelus and Hermogenes."[1] Now both his occupations, and the words, "Salute them of the household of Narcissus, which are in the Lord; salute them which are of the household of Aristobulus, who are in the Lord," as well as the numerous names of slaves, such as Tryphæna and Tryphosa, Persis, Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermes, Nereus, &c., show that Paul's connection was with the lowest social strata. We are brought back to the same world of slave-rooms and back alleys by the account in the Acts telling how the followers of Paul carried away handkerchiefs and aprons and laid them on the sick, so that the diseases departed from them and the evil spirits went out.[2] But beside these small folk, there were persons of greater importance, such as the itinerant teachers Sosthenes and Apollos, who both carried weight with Corinthians,[3] and those Jewish merchants who were as well known in Jerusalem as in Rome.

The account in the Acts is written from the point of view neither of friend nor of foe; but is confined to showing in a few somewhat anecdotal traits the strong impression made by Paul's activity in the capital of Asia. It tells of seven sons of the Jewish high-priest Sceva, who attempted "to name over them which had the evil spirits the name of the Lord Jesus whom Paul preacheth." But one of these evil spirits retorted: "Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye?" Again, the famous Ephesian books, which accepted the Ephesian goddess as the representative of the magic of the moonlit night, Hecate, play their part in the narrative. Christians who had formerly practised magic brought their cabbalistic books together and burned them; "and they counted the price of them, and found it fifty

[1] 2 Tim. i. 15.
[2] Acts xix. 12.
[3] 1 Cor. i. 1, xvi. 12.

thousand pieces of silver."[1] It may be presumed that this valuation was extremely arbitrary, for Nereus and Phlegon and Persis and the other slaves could hardly have owned books of magic worth £2000. But it has been rightly conjectured that the writer only meant the narrative as a protest against the name of Simon Magus, whom the Jewish Christians compared with Paul; while the seven sons of the Jewish high-priest, who try to work miracles in the name of Jesus, but are denied by him, embody the reminiscence of the struggles with the Judaists.

Equally remarkable is the well-known account of Demetrius' riot. According to the Acts, a silversmith Demetrius, who made small models of the temple of Diana for private use, stirred up the handicraftsmen against Paul because the spread of Christianity prejudiced their trade. The handicraftsmen consequently caused a tumult, rushing to the theatre with the cry, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" while others laid hands on the two Macedonian Christians, Gaius and Aristarchus, intending to bring them before the people. Paul was eager to sally forth and quiet the people, but his disciples, perhaps Aquila and Priscilla with whom he lived, prevented him. The Asiarchs also sent him word not to leave the house. So the multitude stayed for a while in the theatre, shouting, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" until the town-clerk, in a very reasonable speech, persuaded them to go home.

Now the description of this tumult is an obvious anachronism. At the time the author of the Acts wrote, when Pliny, as proconsul, could complain that the temples were being emptied by the Christians, then indeed the handicraftsmen had reason to look askance at Christianity for the sake of their pagan trade. But in Paul's time, the traffic in idols could not yet possibly have been affected by the gospel of the tiny Ephesian community.

[1] Acts xix. 19. One of these Ἐφέσια γράμματα is to be found in Clem. Alex. Strom. v. 8, 46. Referring to the moon-goddess, it says: "My darkness is a pale darkness. Look up faithfully to the light. He is true that leadeth a shining life." Zimmermann, Ephes. 118.

Still it is clear from the Apostle's own writings that the theatre of Ephesus was indubitably the scene of an event in his life which made no small impression on him. This perhaps is the event he has in view when, in 1 Cor. iv. 9, he writes of Ephesus: "God hath set forth us the apostles last of all, as men doomed to death: for we are made a spectacle unto the world, both to angels and to men." He puts it more clearly how he was made a spectacle for men and angels when in the same Epistle he asks: "If after the manner of men I fought with beasts at Ephesus, what doth it profit me?"[1] Not that it is likely Paul engaged in a real fight with wild beasts and escaped from it by a miraculous deliverance. Such an event would scarcely have been lost to the recollection of history: but it is certain that this remarkable expression refers to some episode in the theatre. At the same time the danger run by Paul on this occasion must have been extremely serious, as the Acts suggests, if Paul expects great reward on the day of Christ for having fought with wild beasts at Ephesus. He speaks, too, of bodily ill-treatment he suffered at Ephesus: "Even unto this present hour we both hunger and thirst, and are naked and are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling-place; and we toil, working with our own hands; being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we endure; being defamed, we entreat; we are made as the filth of the world, the offscouring of all things, even until now."[2]

From these words, the Apostle's Ephesian period can be clearly depicted. They support the conjecture that the riot of the pious handicraftsmen was more serious than is represented by the Acts. In particular it must be conjectured that the Acts, which is inclined deliberately to represent the proconsuls, archons and authorities as protectors of early Christianity, here, as elsewhere, puts too favourable a colour on the part played by the Asiarchs, "being his friends." They were made to act thus as a precedent to Roman officials of the time of the Acts. A further obscurity is the part played in the riot at the theatre by the Alexander

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 32. [2] 1 Cor. iv. 11, seq.

mentioned in Acts xix. 33. In the documents drawn upon by the Acts he had already been mentioned, as is shown by the way in which he is assumed to be well known without comment. He was a Christian, because he comes forward to exculpate the Christians. In Ephesus, however, we know of but one Christian Alexander, Paul's rabid enemy and partner of the Demetrius mentioned in 2 Tim. iv. 14. It is the more likely to suppose that the Acts gave this fragmentary account of Alexander's action deliberately, because the attitude of the Jewish Christians did not tally with the picture of peace in apostolic times which it wishes to lay before its readers. All that can be said, then, is, that the affair in the theatre was so serious that Paul calls it a spectacle for angels and men, and expects it to be remembered on the day of the Lord. Indeed, it was his most terrible experience, else he would not exclaim, If the dead are not raised, what doth it profit me that I fought with wild beasts? We might rather think of one of those scenes provoked in the theatre of Ephesus by Apollonius of Tyana, who led a vast crowd to the theatre, and there made them stone an old man in whom he suspected the demon that had brought the plague to the city. Then, it is alleged, when the heap of stones was removed, there lay the dead body of a Molossian dog which had gone mad.[1]

This period of stubborn fighting in Asia is interrupted by journeys to Galatia, Corinth, Illyria and Macedonia, involving great dangers for Paul, for it is not long before he writes of a shipwreck, when he was a night and a day in the deep.[2] The intermediate months of rest in Ephesus gave rise to new excitements; and to fill up the measure of suffering, he was again attacked by a fearful access of his malady. "Concerning this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me. And He hath said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my power is made perfect in weakness."[3] In the midst of it all, Paul might boast that, though his outward man was thus torn, his inward man was renewed from day to day. "I take

[1] Philostr. Apoll. iv. 10. [2] 2 Cor. xi. 25. [3] 2 Cor. xii. 8, seq.

pleasure in weaknesses, in injuries, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ's sake: for when I am weak, then am I strong."[1] The truth was, that no prejudices, no banishment or ill-usage, could prevent his success. The number of the churches had already increased to such an extent that he groans over the burden of daily care and anxiety for all the churches. "Who is weak, and I am not weak? Who is made to stumble, and I burn not?"[2] Indeed, a series of churches had grown up meanwhile throughout the province of Asia, as is shown by the greeting "of the churches of Asia" which Paul finds it necessary to send in the year 58.

In the same year, however, an event of later date than the "fight with beasts" he underwent in the "theatre," drove him permanently out of Ephesus, so that he never ventured to revisit the city. The only references to it we possess are Paul's own at the beginning of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. "For," he writes, "we would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning our affliction which befel us in Asia, that we were weighed down exceedingly, beyond our power, insomuch that we despaired even of life: yea, we ourselves have had the sentence of death within ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God which raiseth the dead: who delivered us out of so great a death, and will deliver; on whom we have set our hope that He will also still deliver us; ye also helping together on our behalf by your supplication."[3] As is shown by the concluding words, therefore, there still remained the danger of so great a death befalling him even in Macedonia; for here, too, his flesh wins no rest; without is strife, within he is oppressed by fear.[4]

The first thing that suggests itself is some measure of the authorities or machinations of the Jews threatening him with a terrible death. He himself chooses the image of the hunted quarry to describe his life. He is oppressed, but in his straits a loophole appears;[5] the *impasse* opens, and by God's grace he

[1] 2 Cor. xii. 10. [2] 2 Cor. xi. 28. [3] 2 Cor. i. 8—11.
[4] 2 Cor. vii. 5. [5] 2 Cor. iv. 7; *θλιβόμενοι, ἀλλ' οὐ στενοχωρούμενοι.*

escapes. He sees no outlet, but when he concludes this is the end at last, salvation is revealed.[1] The persecutors pursue him, but he does not perish;[2] he is smitten down, yet not destroyed.[3] Even so they may have hounded him down in the narrow lanes of Ephesus, but God delivered him from so dreadful a death. There is perhaps some connection between this great danger, in which he already despaired of his life, and the salutation incidentally sent by him to Aquila and Priscilla at Ephesus, "who for my life laid down their own necks,"[4] and at the same time to the Ephesian Junias and Andronicus, as his former fellow-prisoners. Now since Paul had worked with Aquila nowhere else except Corinth, where struggles of this kind did not take place, this expression can only refer to Ephesus, and consequently the prison was the place where "we ourselves have had the answer of death within ourselves," and from which the brethren delivered him by laying down their necks for him.

To inquire now into the results of his labour, it is clear that, though he left a considerable number of churches behind him, yet finally, according to his own confession, "those of Asia all turned away from him." On his last journey, he dares not preach openly at Ephesus, lest his enemies should seize him, but sends for his friends to meet him at Miletus. Vain labour! The Jews of Ephesus actually come to the feast at Jerusalem and there denounce him to the frenzied populace. These Ephesian "Jews" indeed are so well acquainted with him and his followers, that they have actually been taken for Jewish Christians. As to Alexander, the copper-smith, however, Paul complains from Rome even that he had done him much evil: "The Lord will render unto him according to his works." The writer of the Acts, also, is aware that the issue of the struggle against the upholders of the law was not in favour of the Apostle; for in the interview with the elders at Miletus, he puts into his mouth the

[1] *ἀπορούμενοι, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξαπορούμενοι*, verse 8.

[2] *διωκόμενοι ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγκαταλειπόμενοι*, verse 9.

[3] *καταβαλλόμενοι, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀπολλύμενοι.* [4] Rom. xvi. 3.

prophecy that after his departure grievous wolves should come, not sparing the flock, while amongst themselves at Ephesus men should arise speaking perverse things. As if in self-defence against the calumnies, which he also defends himself against in his Epistles, Paul refers to his blameless and unselfish life amongst them, as though he knew, what already the writer of the Acts knew, the distorted picture drawn of him after his death by the Judaists as an "evil man, whom the church would not endure." Within four years of his death, as the Apocalypse shows, the struggle in the churches of Asia Minor was decided against him.

The proceedings in Antioch and Galatia show what were the cardinal points of this struggle: yet it is noteworthy that the adversaries here on Hellenic ground drop the cruder Semitic requirements. There is no question here of circumcision for Gentile Christians, such as was carried out in Galatia. Abstention is demanded from meats offered to idols and from fornication: at the utmost, obedience to the Noachian ordinances; but at the same time care is taken to impose no heavier burden on the Greeks, and to console them for those already assumed, with the speedy coming of the Lord.[1] Undoubtedly we obtain an insight into the position of parties from the Apocalypse, written four years after the death of Paul. Now as this book frequently indulges in retrospect, and its injunctions refer to the capital of a province of not less than five hundred cities, the picture drawn in the seven missives to the churches of Asia is not merely the transitory position of the year 68, but the situation of a great union unchanged in essentials for a decade.

As to the difficult question, Who was the John who wrote the Apocalypse? no decisive answer can yet be given. His Judaistic point of view and Hebraic Greek make it probable that he was a native of Palestine; his constant references to the Holy Land make it almost certain. Unconsciously he makes his native land the scene of his apocalyptic drama. He stands

[1] Rev. ii. 24, 25.

upon the sea-shore and sees the legions gather together.[1] In the far east he sees the Euphrates, where the Parthians muster their troops of horse;[2] he sees the caverns of Palestine, where men sought refuge;[3] he knows Jerusalem and the temple from without and within,[4] and even, on one occasion, gives the length of the Holy Land in stades.[5] He describes himself as a servant of God, as a brother and partaker in the tribulation, the kingdom and the patience of Jesus,[6] and as a brother of the prophets.[7] Among the prominent natives of Jerusalem to whom writings are ascribed by tradition, two only bear the name of John, namely, the brother of James the son of Zebedee, and Barnabas' nephew, John Mark. It is almost impossible to regard the Apostle John as the author, for the Apocalypse speaks of the apostles as having already entered into heaven;[8] and it would hardly beseem an apostle to give the names of the twelve apostles to the twelve foundation-stones of the new Jerusalem,[9] and to praise the Church for rejecting those who call themselves apostles and are not.[10] Of the well-known characters of the first Christian generation, there remains, therefore, only John Mark, who undoubtedly was simply called John in Jewish circles.[11] Though he quarrelled with Paul, he continued his life of missionary work in the Mediterranean, and first at Cyprus, whence he may well have migrated to Ephesus. So he in turn has been put forward as the writer of the Apocalypse.[12] All that is certain, however, is, that soon after Paul's death a native of Palestine named John stands at the head of Judaist Asia, and assumes an attitude of authority towards all churches in this great province.

We know from the Pauline Epistles that numerous churches had been founded by the Apostle, but the actual places are not

[1] Rev. xiii. 1. [2] Rev. ix. 1. [3] Rev. vi. 15, ix. 13, xvi. 12.
[4] Rev. xi. and xxi. [5] Rev. xiv. 20.
[6] Rev. i. 1, 9. [7] Rev. xxii. 9. [8] Rev. xviii. 20, xvii. 6.
[9] Rev. xxi. 12. [10] Rev. ii. 2. [11] Acts xiii. 5, 13.
[12] Hitzig, John Mark; Zürich, 1843, p. 11, seq., and pp. 67—116.

mentioned in the Epistles, so that it remains uncertain whether he was the founder of the Christian churches known to us. The only churches expressly attributed to Paul are those of the district of Troas, including that of Troas itself, where the brother Carpus had a shelter for the brethren, and the neighbouring churches as far as Assos. "A great door" had opened for Paul when he reached this city after his flight from Ephesus in the beginning of the year 58.[1] It is at least probable, from Acts xx. 17, that he also founded a church in Miletus. Finally, the churches of Colossæ, Laodicea and Hierapolis in Phrygia, are foundations of his disciples.[2] "Salute the brethren that are in Laodicea," says the Epistle to the Colossians, "and Nymphas and the church that is in his house."[3]

Now it is noteworthy that the writer of the Apocalypse, who, ten years after, sends the churches of proconsular Asia strict commandments as to their religious and moral life, has in mind only a part of these churches, and at the same time gives special notice to the insignificant country town of Thyatira and a little church at Philadelphia. The reason can only lie in the partizanship of the writer and the special necessities of the churches to which he sends the circular letters. We see from them, in the first place, that the church of Asia is still in its earlier stages, and that the struggle with the synagogue still continues. At Smyrna, Philadelphia and Pergamus in particular, the churches have first to win in the struggle for existence.

In the rich and beautiful trading-city of SMYRNA arose a church which prays to him who "was dead and lived again." But it is in great tribulation and deep poverty, and blasphemed by the sons of the synagogue, "which say they are Jews, and they are not, but are a synagogue of Satan." For the true Israel is that which accepted the Messiah, not that which rejected him. Nevertheless, these blasphemies will not be fruitless; Satan, according to John's prophecy, will cast some

[1] 2 Cor. ii. 12; Acts xx. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 13.

[2] Col. i. 4, 9, ii. 1, iv. 14. [3] Col. iv. 15.

into prison that they may be tried, and they shall have tribulation ten days. To them, therefore, goes forth the eternally glorious exhortation: "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life."[1]

As in Smyrna, so stood affairs in PHILADELPHIA, one of the principal towns of Lydia, at the foot of Tmolus. This, too, now first comes under our notice; it is rather insignificant, but has a little power, because "it kept the word of the Messiah, and did not deny his name." Those of the synagogue who say they are Jews and are not, shall come and worship at its feet, and know that the Messiah has loved it. The Lord has set an open door before his saints, for he has the key of David, of whom it is said in Isaiah xxii. 22: "He shall open and none shall shut; and he shall shut and none shall open." So he will give them also an open door, and preserve them from the hour of trial which is to come upon the whole world. "I come quickly," he cries to them; "hold fast that which thou hast, that no one take thy crown."[2]

Lastly, a third church, mentioned here for the first time, is that of PERGAMUS. It had grown up in one of the chief cities of paganism, "even where Satan's throne is." Here, indeed, stood a temple of Æsculapius, which actually strove for precedence with the great temple of Diana at Ephesus. What John calls Satan's throne is the image of the god, round which the serpent of Æsculapius coiled—in his eyes, the old serpent from which Judaism derived all heathen idolatry. This serpent-throne was a miracle-working idol; the sick and feeble lay round it till the remedy against their sufferings was revealed to them in a dream or by the mouth of the priest. In a city like this, the capital of superstition, before Satan's throne, where crowds of priests and hieroduli battened on the credulity and ready offerings of suffering humanity, conflicts with "unbelievers" could not fail to occur. Blood, indeed, had already been shed here; and John extols the church: "Thou didst not

[1] Rev. ii. 8—11. [2] Rev. iii. 7—13.

deny my faith, even in the days of Antipas my witness, my faithful one, who was killed amongst you where Satan dwelleth." Nevertheless, dark shadows cross the bright picture of the church which lives faithful unto martyrdom. In the chief seat of a pagan cult, where countless victims were sacrificed, the temptation was great to waive any scruples about the flesh of offerings, which came to market here in great quantities, or to take part in the temple-feasts, which not seldom ended in riot and incontinence. So John had a complaint against the church of Pergamus: "Thou hast there some that hold the teaching of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling-block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed to idols, and to commit fornication. So hast thou also some that hold the teaching of the Nicolaitans in like manner. Repent therefore; or else I come to thee quickly, and I will make war against them with the sword of my mouth." By the teaching of Balaam, the writer means participation in sacrifice to idols and pagan incontinence, because Balaam, the enemy of Moses, was he[1] who taught Balak, king of Moab, to sunder Israel from Jehovah by seducing them into heathen carousals and fornication. John gives them the further name of Nicolaitans because Nicolaos is, so to say, a translation of Balaam; for as Balaam means destroyer of the people, so Nicolaos is conqueror of the people. Possibly, indeed, the writer of the Apocalypse came to make this play upon words because, in his time, the thoughtless Gentile Christians of Asia Minor used to invoke the deacon Nicolaos, on whose name alone in the list of deacons any remark is made by the Acts, and that the significant one, "a proselyte of Antioch."[2] At all events, the Fathers derive the "sect" of the Nicolaitans from this Nicolaos.[3] True disciples of Paul could not treat attendance at the temple-feasts and the inconceivable indulgence of natural desires after the Greek fashion as being indifferent; they must therefore have entirely forgotten the strenuous exhortations of 1 Corinthians.

[1] Numb. xxv. 2. [2] Acts vi. 5. [3] Eus. iii. 29.

The same reckless tendency of Gentile Christianity is bewailed by the writer of the Apocalypse at THYATIRA. This little town of Lydia was the native place of Lydia, the seller of purple, who was converted by Paul at Philippi, together with some friends of hers, amongst them Syntyche and Euodia, who afterwards quarrelled. It was through her, perhaps, that Christianity was planted in Thyatira, where once more a woman appears as head of the community. But in the time of John the principles which had effected an entry here were not Pauline, but Nicolaitan; and the woman who had gained such influence in the Church is, in the eyes of the Apocalypse, a new Jezebel who distracts Israel. The Messiah knows well the works of the Church and its patience. "But I have this against thee," he is made to say by John, "that thou sufferest the woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess; and she teacheth and seduceth my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed to idols. And I gave her time that she should repent; and she willeth not to repent of her fornication. Behold, I do cast her into a bed, and them that commit adultery with her into great tribulation, except they repent of their works. And I will kill her children with death; and all the churches shall know that I am he which searcheth the veins and hearts; and I will give unto each one of you according to your works."

From these words there is not the slightest doubt that immoral excesses of a gross nature had not only occurred, but had become habitual in this little church of Christ; nay, more, were actually justified by such reasons as that it was necessary "to know the deep things of Satan." Paul had to check similar outbursts in Corinth, where a lax party regarded incontinence as the gratification of a natural instinct in itself indifferent. Here, too, it may be, those who adopted this course were misguided disciples of the Apostle. In Corinth, at all events, they started from his view that the new man is spirit, and has nothing more to do with the flesh; and drew the inference that all actions in the flesh were indifferent, and that all things were permitted to

the spiritual man.[1] So the phrase about "the deep things of Satan" is an echo of the Pauline phrases, "the deep things of God" which the spirit searcheth,[2] and "the depth of God's wisdom and knowledge."[3]

Nevertheless, even in Thyatira the party of laxity was opposed by a little band hating this abomination and subjecting themselves to the rules for proselytes; but this latter party feared the leaders of Judaism would soon compel them to be subject to the law in its entirety. So John thinks it necessary to calm them: "But to you I say, to the rest that are in Thyatira, as many as have not this teaching, I cast upon you none other burden. Howbeit that which ye have, hold fast till I come." The fear, then, of circumcision and further Jewish precepts was the instrument by which this Jezebel kept her followers apart from John, who is willing to dispense with new burdens if only certain of enforcing the rules for proselytes accepted by the pure.

Another foundation of Paul's, the church of LAODICEA, is as unsuccessful as Thyatira in securing John's approval. The Messiah reproaches it with being neither hot nor cold. The proverbial wealth of Laodicea, the inexhaustible in resources, had made even the Christians of that city lukewarm.[4] They go about in golden ornaments and fine white garments, saying: "I am rich, and have gotten riches, and have need of nothing." So the church knows not that it is "wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked." Wherefore the Messiah says unto it: "I counsel thee to buy of me gold refined by fire, that thou mayest become rich; and white garments, that thou mayest clothe thyself, and that the shame of thy nakedness be not made manifest; and eye-salve to anoint thine eyes, that thou mayest see. As many as I love, I reprove and chasten: be zealous, therefore, and repent. Behold, I stand at the door and knock."[5]

[1] 1 Cor. vi. 9—20. [2] 1 Cor. ii. 10.
[3] Rom. xi. 33; cf. Ephes. iii. 18; Rom. x. 7.
[4] Tac. Ann. xiv. 27. [5] Rev. iii. 14—20.

Like Laodicea, SARDIS has indeed the name of living, but really is dead. "Be thou watchful, and stablish the things that remain, which were ready to die; for I have found no works of thine fulfilled before my God." "Repent, therefore; for I will come as a thief in the night." Nevertheless, here once more there stands over against the dead a small band "which did not defile their garments; and they shall walk with the Messiah in white; for they are worthy."

So the writer of the Apocalypse cannot call good all that he sees in the churches of Asia. There is much that he denounces with the uncompromising severity of one who spews everything lukewarm out of his mouth, and hates those that are neither hot nor cold. Nor does he give a cheering description of the moral situation; but we know, indeed, from Paul's own lips how lacking in one department of morals the churches of Gentile Christians were; and in luxurious centres of population like Sardis, Laodicea and Smyrna, the same temptations must have been the cause of the same evils as in the churches of Thessalonica and Corinth. The writer of the Apocalypse, however, accustomed to the self-restraint and strict morality of the Jewish household, is proportionately more shocked at such vices than the founder of the churches. It is, indeed, conceivable that as a Jew he ascribed all these evils to the freedom of the Gentile Christians from the law, a concession against which he and his had always striven most zealously. Observance of the Jewish law would, according to his view, check even such excesses as these. Hence he considers it the teaching of Balaam that any man should venture to eat things sacrificed to idols, not to speak of incontinence.

Now although in the matter of things sacrificed to idols Paul constantly recommended the sparing of the weaker brethren, although he took extreme measures—the giving over of sinners to Satan—against Greek incontinence, still John makes him and his principles responsible for everything. Besides, an adversary can scarcely be expected to look at extensions of a detested

principle as anything but its necessary consequences. This is the key to John's chief satisfaction with the one church in which Paul found his bitterest opponents, and whence he was finally expelled without hope of return. It is EPHESUS of which the Apocalypse boasts: "I know that thou canst not bear evil men, and didst try them which call themselves apostles, and they are not, and didst find them false; and thou hast patience and didst bear for my name's sake, and hast not grown weary." The expulsion of Paul's following of course put an end to those excesses of indulgence in meat sacrificed to idols and forbidden sins: so John boasts that the church hates the works of the Nicolaitans, which are also hated by the Messiah. Yet he cannot conceal the fact that the church has left its first love, and that its first works have grown few. He even threatens the parent church of Asia that if its works do not correspond better to the place of honour it assumes, its candlestick shall be removed out of its place.

Disturbance, then, and incompleteness in every respect, were still dominant four years after Paul's death, in a church for which the Apostle had endured much strife and toil. Nowhere so much as a prospect of settlement; everywhere the advance of Judaism; though victory must needs fall ultimately to the Pauline views in a Gentile population. Here the old experience comes true again: only common souls see the fruits of their labour, while the seed sown by great natures comes up but slowly.

The identical antagonisms brought together here by the life of the Apostle as told in history, re-appear in Achaia, the other sphere of his labours. There, too, we find "those who say they are apostles," and the adversaries say they are not; there, too, we have Nicolaitans who teach how to prepare stumbling-blocks, and more than one Jezebel who seduce the brethren into pleasant sins. But what the writer of the Apocalypse puts before us in prophetic pictures, stands there before our eyes in naked reality. A dismal scene and yet instructive, as showing how difficult a

foundation the first labourers of the kingdom of God had to prepare, and how they set about realizing the loftiest ideal in a world that had sunk so low. The main stream of development we have followed so far, here runs in a narrow channel, where we see on a small scale what impediments occasionally hindered its course, troubled its waters, and threatened them with stagnation; we see, too, how strong a hand was needed to clear their channel. So the disturbances at Corinth, of which we have detailed information, are significant as showing us how the greater difficulties appeared on a small scale.

C. Green & Son, Printers, 178, Strand.

BS 2407 .H3713 v.3
Hausrath, Adolf, 1837-1909.
A history of the New
Testament times

BS 2407 .H3713 v.3
Hausrath, Adolf, 1837-1909.
A history of the New
Testament times

DATE	ISSUED TO

...ve Baptist
... the East

S

Seminary of the East
Libraries
1-888-THE-EAST

Denver Seminary Library
Washington DC Extension
1st Bapt Church Glenarden
3600 Brightseat Road
Landover, MD 20785-2414